27660

NATIONAL LIBRARY
OTTAWA

BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE
OTTAWA

NAME OF AUTHOR Margaret Haughey

TITLE OF THESIS Consultative Practices in Elementary Schools

UNIVERSITY of Alberta, Edmonton

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED Ph. D

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED 1976

Permission is hereby granted to THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Margaret Haughey

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

8546 - 81 Avenue
EDMONTON

DATED March 19 1976

NL-91 (10-68)

INFORMATION TO USERS

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

This copy was produced from a microfiche copy of the original document. The quality of the copy is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Canadian Theses Division
Cataloguing Branch
National Library of Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

AVIS AUX USAGERS

LA THESE A ETE MICROFILMEE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS RECUE

Cette copie a été faite à partir d'une microfiche du document original. La qualité de la copie dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise pour le microfimage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

NOTA BENE: La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer. Microfilmée telle que nous l'avons reçue.

Division des thèses canadiennes
Direction du catalogage
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

CONSULTATIVE PRACTICES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

© MARGARET LAGAN HAUGHEY

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
SPRING, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled CONSULTATIVE PRACTICES IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, submitted by Margaret Lagan Haughey in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

James M. Small
Supervisor

E A Holdaway

Ian E. Housego
External Examiner

Date 31. October. 1975

ABSTRACT

This study sought to describe present consultative practices in selected Alberta schools. In particular, teachers were asked to provide information concerning their consultative needs, the personnel whom they consulted, their perceptions of themselves as consultants, their satisfaction with the consultative assistance which they received and their reasons for not seeking assistance.

Questionnaires and follow-up interviews were used to obtain data from eighty teachers who constituted the complete staffs of three elementary schools in a small Alberta school system.

Results of the study indicated that the majority of teachers had sought assistance in setting up courses, choosing appropriate materials, using audio-visual equipment, identifying students' learning problems, developing remedial programs, obtaining background information on students and solving teacher-pupil problems.

In all task areas except "Interpreting curriculum guides" the majority of concerns recurred throughout the September-February period. The most important concerns during September-October were in the interpretation of curriculum guides, the development of course outlines, the selection of instructional materials and in grouping students for instruction.

Within the general task areas, teachers sought to discuss and share ideas about students, materials and teaching strategies, to obtain information on specific teaching techniques, to supplement

their knowledge of subject matter and concepts and to obtain assistance in the diagnosis of student learning difficulties and the development of strategies to remedy them.

Personnel in formal positions, remedial reading specialists, and colleagues teaching at the same grade level, were the persons most often consulted by teachers.

While the majority of teachers considered that they had provided consultative assistance "at least twice a week", over half of these interactions were not identified by their colleagues. Of interactions where teachers indicated seeking consultative assistance, only 32 to 40 percent of these interactions were identifed by the consultants.

Teachers were generally satisfied with the consultative assistance which they obtained, although teachers with most years of teaching experience and post-secondary education were less likely to indicate that the information was satisfactory.

Twenty-seven of the eighty teachers did not seek consultative assistance in an area of concern. The most common reasons given included that they had no one to ask, the item was not a major concern, or they did not have time to seek consultative assistance.

When teacher interactions were examined, it was found that in almost half of the interactions in each school, the consultant was also a friendship choice. This was most evident in School 3 where the staff had been together as a unit for the longest period of time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank all those who contributed towards the successful completion of this study, especially the school personnel who so readily cooperated in the collection of the data.

In particular, I would like to warmly thank my chairman, Dr. J. Small, for his patient and generous advice and encouragement. His incisive comments and thorough analysis of the preliminary draft were instrumental in moving the study towards its successful conclusion.

I would also like to mention the contributions of my other committee members who helped develop the study to its final form, and in particular, I warmly appreciated the constructive questioning of my external examiner, Dr. Ian Housego.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr. E.A. Holdaway who suggested the research topic and whose ready and extensive assistance throughout was greatly appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS 1

    INTRODUCTION 1

    STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 4

        Statement of Problem 1 4

        Statement of Problem 2 6

        Statement of Problem 3 6

        Statement of Problem 4 7

        Statement of Problem 5 8

        Statement of Problem 6 8

        Statement of Problem 7 8

        Justification of the Study 9

    OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS 10

        Consultation 10

        Consultative Assistance 11

        Teachers 11

        Socialization 11

        Interactions 11

        Formal Consultative Network 11

        Non-Formal Consultative Network 11

        Total Consultative Network 12

    ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS 12

Chapter Page

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK 13

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 13

Consultation 13

Research Studies 14

Identification of Teachers' Consultative Needs . . . 19

Preliminary Study by Plamondon 21

General Review of Studies on Consultation 23

Organizational Network of Schools 24

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK 29

SUMMARY 33

3. RESEARCH DESIGN 35

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS 35

Choice of Instruments 35

Instrumentation 36

Validity of Instruments 38

DATA-COLLECTION PROCEDURES 39

TREATMENT OF DATA 40

DELIMITATIONS, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 40

Delimitations 40

Assumptions 40

Limitations 40

SUMMARY 41

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS 42

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS 42

ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM 44

Chapter Page

FORMAL CONSULTATIVE ORGANIZATION 45

SUMMARY 46

5. TASK AREAS SELECTED BY TEACHERS 48

SUB-PROBLEM 1.1 48

SUB-PROBLEM 1.2 50

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education 51

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience 54

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System 57

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School 60

Responses Classified by Grade Division 63

Responses Classified by Formal Position 65

SUB-PROBLEM 1.3 68

SUB-PROBLEM 1.4 68

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education 70

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience 70

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School 73

Responses Classified by Grade Division 73

SUB-PROBLEM 1.5 76

SUB-PROBLEM 1.6 76

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience 78

Responses Classified by Grade Division 78

SUB-PROBLEM 1.7 78

Chapter Page

SUB-PROBLEM 1.8 80

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education 80

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience 82

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School 84

Responses Classified by Grade Division 86

SUMMARY 86

6. SPECIFIC CONCERNS OF TEACHERS 90

SUB-PROBLEM 2.1 90

SUB-PROBLEM 2.2 95

Developing Course Outlines 95

Selecting Instructional Materials 98

Developing Unit/Lesson Plans 100

Developing Instructional Materials 103

Evaluating Lessons/Units 105

Teaching Concepts, Constructs, Generalizations . . . 107

Developing/Using Small Group Activities 109

Planning Individualized Instruction 112

Grouping for Instruction 115

Operating Audio-Visual Equipment 117

Using Kits, Charts, Games, Simulations 119

Developing Own Audio-Visual Materials 122

Obtaining Student-Background Information 124

SUMMARY 126

All Specific Concerns Combined 126

Chapter Page

Specific Concerns in Each Task Area 127

Specific Concerns by Selected Teacher Characteristics 131

7. PROVISION OF CONSULTATION 135

SUB-PROBLEM 3.1 135

SUB-PROBLEM 3.2 135

SUB-PROBLEM 3.3 144

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Educaton 144

Responses Classified by Formal Position 146

Responses Classified by Sex 146

PROBLEM 4 146

Sub-Problem 4.1 146

Sub-Problem 4.2 150

Sub-Problem 4.3 150

Sub-Problem 4.4 154

PROBLEM 5 154

Sub-Problem 5.1 154

Curriculum and Program Task Areas 156

Instructional Task Areas 158

Audio-Visual Technology Task Areas 159

Special Student Needs Task Areas 159

Sub-Problem 5.2 159

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education 160

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience 160

Chapter Page

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School 162

Responses Classified by Grade Division 162

Responses Classified by Formal Position 162

Responses Classified by School Staffs 165

PROBLEM 6 165

Sub-Problem 6.1 165

Sub-Problem 6.2 167

PROBLEM 7 169

Sub-Problem 7.1 169

Sub-Problem 7.2 175

SUMMARY 180

8. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 183

SUMMARY 183

Restatement of the Problems 183

Research Methodology 183

Review of the Findings 184

Relevance of the Findings to the Literature on Consultation 190

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 195

Suggested Research Studies 198

REFERENCES 199

APPENDIX

INSTRUMENTS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION 208

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Percentage Distribution of Characteristics of Respondents in Total and by School 43

2. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area 49

3. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Post-Secondary Education 52

4. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Total Years of Teaching Experience 55

5. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in the School System 58

6. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in Present School 61

7. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Grade Division 64

8. Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Formal Position in School 66

9. Percentage Distribution of Concerns in Each Task Area for All Teachers 69

10. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Years of Post-Secondary Education 71

11. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Total Years of Teaching Experience 72

12. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in Present School 74

13. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Grade Division 75

Table Page

14. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Time of Year 77

15. Distribution of Teachers by Type of Concerns, by Total Years of Teaching Experience 79

16. Distribution of Teachers by Type of Concerns, by Grade Division 79

17. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Years of Post-Secondary Education 81

18. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Total Years of Teaching Experience 83

19. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Years of Employment in School 85

20. Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Grade Division 87

21. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Each Task Area 91

22. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 1 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 96

23. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 2 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 99

24. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 3 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 101

Table Page

25. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 4 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 104

26. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 5 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 106

27. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 8 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 108

28. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 10 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 110

29. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 11 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 113

30. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 14 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 116

31. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 15 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 118

32. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 16 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 120

Table Page

33. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 17 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 123

34. Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 20 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division 125

35. Total Number of Personnel Consulted by Each Teacher During September-February Period 136

36. Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 1 138

37. Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 2 139

38. Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 3 140

39. Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Years of Post-Secondary Education 145

40. Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Formal Position 145

41. Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Sex 147

42. Number of Personnel For Whom Each Teacher Indicated the Provision of Consultative Assistance 149

43. Number of Times Each Teacher Was Named as Consultant 151

44. Percentage Comparisons of Interactions Where Teachers Perceived Themselves as Consultants and Interactions Where Teachers Were Named as Consultant, for Each School 152

Table Page

45. Distribution of Teachers by Perceived Frequency of Provision of Consultative Assistance 155

46. Distribution of Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area 157

47. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Years of Post-Secondary Education 161

48. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Total Years of Teaching Experience 161

49. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Years of Employment in School 163

50. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Grade Division 163

51. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Formal Position 164

52. Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by School Staffs 164

53. Number of Teachers in Each Task Area Who Desired But Did Not Seek Consultative Assistance 166

54. Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Seeking Consultative Assistance 168

55. Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Consultative Assistance, by Grade Level Taught in School 1 170

56. Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Consultative Assistance, by Grade Level Taught in School 2 171

57. Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Consultative Assistance, by Grade Level Taught in School 3 172

58. Percentage Comparisons of Friendship Choices in the Informal Socialization Network and Interactions in the Non-Formal Consultation Network, for Each School 176

59. Percentage Comparisons of Friendship Choices in the Informal Socialization Network and Interactions in the Total Consultation Network, for Each School 178

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

INTRODUCTION

One of the marks of a professional is the desire to keep abreast of knowledge in his field (Wilensky, 1970). In education, the importance of continuing education for all teaching personnel has long been considered essential. However, teachers were commonly assumed to lack motivation for professional development, and supervision, therefore, became a function "to induce or force instructional improvement" (Wilson et al., 1969), a strategy which has met with only mixed success. Corey (1963) commented:

> The primary job of the supervisor is still to do whatever he thinks will be successful to get someone else to work more effectively, more productively. What has changed in connection with supervision . . . is that more and more people recognize that the method of getting another person to do his work better, that had seemed so straightforward and reasonable and has been in use for a long, long time, is not very effective.

An alternative supervisory approach to the traditional format just described has been suggested by Lucio (1967:10):

> . . . increasingly, teachers and supervisors will establish lateral working relationships with one another, and by replanning their ways of working develop non-hierarchical, collegial, team strategies to tackle the problems facing schools in our society.

This is similar to the integrated approach to school supervision described by Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971:105) which they saw as being:

> based on the development of highly effective work groups who are committed to the goals of the school and who work toward this end as a means of professional growth and development and personal self-fulfilment.

The assumptions underlying these alternate approaches differ in several important aspects from those that form the basis for traditional supervision. Changes include not only a recognition that teachers can assume responsibility for their professional development but also that (MacDonald, 1963:3):

> 1. Teaching is a complex integration of behaviors and single behavior chains cannot profitably be grafted onto the teacher's behavioral system.
>
> 2. It is morally wrong to set out to change teacher behavior unless the change sought has been rationally selected by the teacher from a range of known alternatives.
>
> 3. Learning is an individual matter and how something is learned is determined primarily by the internal structure of needs, perceptions, readiness, motivations, etc., of the individual -- not by the external conditions of an outside person desiring change.

The increased involvement of teachers in continuing education has not been entirely due to the adoption of a more collegial approach to supervision or to the increased professionalization of the teacher. Other factors especially relevant to the Alberta situation include the pressure over the years to raise the formal requirements of teachers, the latest development being the requirement of four years of professional preparation for permanent certification by 1976, the close link that has always existed between teachers' salaries and their formal qualifications, and greater emphasis upon the teacher's role as organizer, curriculum developer, coordinator and facilitator coupled with the introduction of new curricula in all the major subject areas within the last ten years.

Continuing education programs for teachers can usually be divided into group activities such as seminars, lectures, and workshops, organized on a school, system-wide, or zone basis, and individual activities involving the teacher and a person providing consultative assistance. While group sessions are a common form of in-service education, consultation on an individual basis is less so since "the sheer number of schools and classrooms makes it unmanageable to provide a full corps of expert specialists in each locality" (MacKay, 1971:11). Miklos (1971:11) also pointed out that few school systems can provide sufficient personnel for individual consultation since needs differ over time, and expertise may be required for only short periods of time and in many different areas. Financial controls may also be a factor.

Studies on staffing in Canadian school systems have indicated that many systems have very small consultative components. In Alberta in 1972, the four largest school systems with, on average, 2000 instructional personnel employed between eighteen and sixty full-time equivalent instructional and program consultants, while of the other 128 smaller systems, the number of these staff recorded varied between zero and six (Blowers, 1972).

If, as these figures suggest, teachers have to rely on administrative or teaching personnel to provide consultative assistance, then the development of an informal network of consultative services is likely. This raises a number of questions about the development of such a network, the bases for the choice of consultative personnel, the types of consultative assistance required, and the efficiency and efficacy of such a network.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study, broadly stated, was to describe the pattern of consultative assistance used in schools. More narrowly, the study sought to describe the actual consultative structure within schools by asking teachers to identify areas in which they had desired consultative assistance, their specific concerns, the personnel within the organizational structure from whom they sought this assistance, the extent of their satisfaction with the information received, and the time of year when the consultation took place. An informal socialization matrix and a non-formal consultative network were constructed for each school. The 80 teachers in three elementary schools in one school system in Alberta formed the population for the study.

Statement of Problem 1

In which task areas and at what period of the school year did teachers desire consultative assistance?

Sub-problem 1.1 How many teachers desired assistance in each task area?

Sub-problem 1.2 To what extent were differences in teachers' specification of consultative task areas associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in the school system,

4. years of employment in their present school,
5. grade division, and
6. formal position in school?

Sub-problem 1.3 Which concerns were most frequently indicated by teachers?

Sub-problem 1.4 Which concerns were most frequently indicated by teachers when examined by:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?

Sub-problem 1.5 What percentage of the concerns mentioned in each task area were recurring?

Sub-problem 1.6 Did teachers who indicated all their concerns as recurring differ significantly from their colleagues in:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school,
4. grade division, and
5. formal position in the school?

Sub-problem 1.7 What percentage of the concerns mentioned in each task area occurred during the September-October period at the beginning of the school year?

Sub-problem 1.8 To what extent were differences in the percentage of concerns which occurred during September-October in each task area associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?

Statement of Problem 2

What were the specific concerns of teachers in each task area?

Sub-problem 2.1 Within each task area, what were teachers' specific concerns?

Sub-problem 2.2 To what extent were differences in the distribution of specific concerns in each task area associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. length of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?

Statement of Problem 3

Whom did teachers ask for assistance?

Sub-problem 3.1 How many persons did each teacher consult?

Sub-problem 3.2 Did teachers tend to seek assistance from fellow teachers teaching the same grade level?

Sub-problem 3.3 Which teachers were consulted most often?

Sub-problem 3.4 To what extent did teachers who were consulted most often overall differ from their colleagues in:

1. sex,
2. years of post-secondary education,
3. total years of teaching experience,
4. length of employment in the school system,
5. length of employment in their present school,
6. grade level, and
7. formal position in the school?

Statement of Problem 4

Did teachers view themselves as providing consultative assistance to others?

Sub-problem 4.1 For how many of their colleagues did teachers indicate that they had provided consultative assistance?

Sub-problem 4.2 How many times was each teacher named as consultant?

Sub-problem 4.3 To what extent were teachers in agreement with others in their estimation of themselves as consultants?

Sub-problem 4.4 How often did teachers say they provided consultative assistance?

Statement of Problem 5

Were teachers satisfied with the consultative assistance which they obtained?

Sub-problem 5.1 What rating did teachers give to the consultative assistance which they obtained?

Sub-problem 5.2 To what extent were differences in the distribution of rating of assistance associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school,
4. grade division,
5. formal position in the school, and
6. staff of each school?

Statement of Problem 6

Did teachers desire but not seek consultative assistance?

Sub-problem 6.1 How many teachers desired but did not seek consultative assistance in each task area?

Sub-problem 6.2 What reasons for their inaction were given by teachers who desired but did not seek assistance?

Statement of Problem 7

What was the pattern of consultative assistance in each school?

Sub-problem 7.1 What was the non-formal consultative network pattern for each school?

Sub-problem 7.2 To what extent did the non-formal consultative network overlap the informal socialization network in each school?

Justification of the Study

Current trends in supervision and consultation (Miklos, 1971:18) indicate that more emphasis has been given to the individual autonomy of the teacher in deciding the means and ends of his professional growth. Rubin (1971:35) in reviewing an article by Jackson (1971) summarized the latter's argument as follows:

> the best clues to a teacher's needs lie in the teaching itself. . . . The teacher is not a helpless learner and his own perception of what will enable him to function more effectively may serve as our most intelligent point of departure. Apart from its psychological validity, such an approach will circumvent the individual's resistance to external direction, and it will make him an active rather than a passive participant in the shaping of his own growth.

This point of view is supported in a recent research study of the professional development needs of a random sample of Alberta teachers by Staples (1970:133) in which over 66 percent of the 521 teachers surveyed indicated that they highly desired "activities designed to improve or update teaching methods or teaching of new curricular matter."

Staples also noted (1970:169):

> The most frequently listed observation by respondents in considering likes, dislikes, and suggested improvements of professional development programs is that practicing teachers want professional development activities to be practical in nature or relevant to the classroom situation. They also want opportunities to exchange professional development ideas or suggestions with colleagues.

Plamondon's 1973 study of teachers' consultative needs in one Alberta school system revealed that over 80 percent of teachers wished to have consultative assistance available upon request in the area of student services, and over 60 percent wanted assistance available in curriculum and program development and in instructional methodology.

Before deciding on an organizational structure which would provide consultation on an individual basis, Miklos (1971) suggested that "We should first have a more adequate analysis of the current conditions (1971:6). . . . An initial first step . . . would be to develop an inventory of the skills and expertise which do exist (within schools)" (1971:13), a position also advocated by Greenfield (1974:13).

Holdaway (1971:3) posed a number of questions concerning consultation:

> Why do teachers need the assistance of consultants? . . . Who needs the assistance of consultants? . . . Who is qualified to give consultative help? . . . In what aspects of classroom teaching do teachers feel they need help? . . . When is such help required? . . . How does the geographical setting of a school influence teachers' needs for consultation?

He commented that while research has provided information in some areas, many deficiencies still exist. This study attempted to provide information relevant to some of these questions.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

Consultation

"Consultation" is defined as an exchange of advice and/or assistance between the classroom teacher and other personnel in the educational setting where the exchange was initiated by the classroom teacher. The personnel to provide the assistance might occupy various positions in a central office or might be in-school personnel.

Consultative Assistance

This term is intended to include all services requested by teachers with respect to the content, processes or outcomes of their teaching.

Teachers

The term "teachers" refers to those in-school personnel holding a teaching certificate.

Socialization

"Socialization" refers to the informal relationships among staff-members which they maintain during their time at the school.

Interactions

"Interactions" are specific communication units where at least one participant indicated that consultation had taken place.

Formal Consultative Network

The "formal consultative network" pattern is made up of the consultations of personnel holding formal positions in the school by their colleagues.

Non-formal Consultative Network

The "non-formal consultative network" describes the pattern of interactions where one participant indicated that he had received consultative assistance.

Total Consultative Network

The "total consultative network" is made up of all interactions in the school.

ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This chapter has provided a brief outline of the research area, statements of the problems and sub-problems and definitions of the terms used in the study.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the related literature on consultation, schools as social systems, the identification of teachers' needs and a description of the conceptual framework of the study.

In Chapter 3, the research methodology, data collection techniques and statistical treatment of the data are discussed.

The population and the organizational structure of each school are discussed in Chapter 4.

Chapter 5 contains a description of the responses to problem 1, concerning the task areas chosen by teachers.

The specific concerns of teachers in each task area, as postulated in problem 2, are discussed in Chapter 6.

The analysis of the data for the remaining problems 3 to 7, is presented in Chapter 7.

Chapter 8 contains the summary, conclusions and implications of the study with suggestions for future research.

The Appendix contains copies of the questionnaire, interview schedule and interview answer sheet.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The review of the literature related to the problems outlined in the previous chapter has been divided into a discussion of four areas: consultation, teacher-peer relations, the organizational network of schools, and the identification of teachers' needs. The conceptual framework which follows from these bases is then discussed.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Moffit (1967:8) concluded that the quality of any school system may largely be determined by the quality of its in-service education for the total professional staff. The continuing educat[illegible] of teachers still depends to a major extent on the supervisory component of of school systems. The aspect of supervision most pertinent to this study is consultation.

Consultation

Consultation has been defined from two general perspectives. From an adminfstrative, organizational viewpoint, it has been described as one of the facets of supervision aimed at the improvement of classroom instruction (Andrews, 1960; Enns, 1968:285; Harris, 1968:11). MacKay (1969:9) defined consultation as "the supervisor's activities as an expert in general or special education" and similarily Lucio and McNeil (1969:24) saw it as the promotion of the improvement of teaching and the curriculum through advice from instructional specialists to teachers, principals, assistant superintendents and others.

This approach stressed the role of the supervisor as the expert and leader, from whom personnel sought assistance. In the most recent literature, the approach is being increasingly disregarded in favor of a humanistic approach to supervision, where the supervisor is seen as a promoter of individual growth and supporter of the professional development of teachers. For example, Sergiovanni (1971:3) has suggested that there has been an overemphasis on supervisors working to provide direct leadership as opposed to working to generate leadership among all those who work in the school. He defined the supervisory role as one which:

> focuses primarily on people, is involved in bringing about change . . . , is dependent upon the identification, acceptance, commitment, and hard work of these people for success and focuses not only on the content of change but sees as a major thrust the continued growth and development of people with whom he works.

In this connection, a number of writers (Babin, 1972; Parsons, 1972; Wilhelms, 1970) have stressed that consultation is not a task confined to supervisors, but rather one which should engage all the expertise available in the school. Miklos (1971:1-2) also stressed the inclusion of personnel other than supervisors in the consultative function, and based his definition of consultation on the interaction between personnel rather than on the role of the consultant as advisor. He used the term consultation to describe:

> the interaction of a teacher or teachers with resource persons on instruction-related matters. Accordingly, consultation takes place when a teacher discusses a problem with a colleague, seeks advice from the principal, plans a program with a supervisor, or interacts with other resource persons.

This definition allows the inclusion of consultations that occur in schools but are disregarded when consultation is viewed entirely from the perspective of the supervisor.

Since the three schools in this study did not have designated in-school consultants or supervisors on staff other than the principal and assistant principal, consultation was defined as any exchange of advice or assistance between the classroom teacher and other personnel in the educational setting where the exchange is initiated by the classroom teacher.

Research Studies

Research on consultation has tended to reflect the historical development of supervision with its change in emphasis from inspection, to leadership and change agent, to supporter and catalyst. However, only those studies which examined the role of various central office supervisors, the role of the principal, teacher-peer assistance, and the identification of teachers' needs were pertinent to this study.

Role of central-office personnel. Many studies have been completed on the role of various central office supervisory personnel (Snelgrove, 1965; Pitsula, 1966; McLoughlin, 1965). McLoughlin (1965) sought the opinions of various groups of superintendents, principals and teachers to define the role of the elementary education supervisor in British Columbia. The functions of the supervisor most often mentioned by the participants were: to provide assistance to teachers and principals, to help obtain instructional materials, to give demonstration lessons, and to arrange for intervisitations of teachers.

Role of the principal. Principals' perceptions of their role have also been extensively examined. In three Alberta research studies, the principal most often saw his role as emphasizing curriculum development and to a lesser extent professional development activities (Hrynyk, 1962; Morin, 1964; Wetter, 1965), while Nova Scotia principals in Harrison's study (1965) indicated that providing consultative assistance to teachers was their main supervisory function. In two studies on teachers' perceptions of the role of the principal, one completed in Alberta (Wetter, 1965) and one in Quebec (Young, 1967), teachers preferred principals who readily provided consultative assistance and did not emphasize direct evaluation of classroom instruction.

Teacher-Peer Assistance

A number of studies have focused on the personnel with whom teachers discussed their concerns and those whom teachers saw as their most valuable source of assistance.

Tower (1965) surveyed 57 inexperienced and 24 experienced beginning teachers to appraise the practices and procedures for teachers' consultative assistance in Indianapolis public schools. He found that although the two groups of teachers were not in complete agreement on the value of all services both agreed that services of most value were help from other teachers and individual conferences with consultants.

In similar studies of the problems of beginning teachers, McGillivray (1966) surveyed 140 Ontario high school teachers, Moller (1968) studied 316 Nebraska high school teachers, while Milne (1968) examined 220 beginning teachers in an Alberta school system. All three researchers reported that teachers received most help from fellow teachers and department heads and least help from principals and central office personnel.

Teachers were also an important influence in a study of the factors that influenced teachers to participate in continuing education activities (Shorey, 1969). From his survey of teachers in an Ontario school system, he concluded:

> Analysis indicated that interaction with colleagues was an important influence on the teacher affecting his attitude to the profession and his involvement in professional activities; it contributed significantly to increasing the teacher's expertise in the preparation and presentation of subject matter; and in establishing and maintaining rapport with students. Such interaction was also perceived by the respondents as contributing significantly to their personal growth (1969:iv).

From a study of the diffusion and adoption of educational changes within the school setting, Carr (1974) who surveyed 380 Iowa elementary and secondary teachers, found that they regarded other teachers as the most influential and credible source for the introduction of new ideas and teaching practices into the school setting. He also noted that the intrinsic reward structure for teachers emphasized the classroom and what goes on within it as being of paramount importance.

Similarly, Gardner (1971) examined the curriculum planning needs of thirty teachers representing all grade levels and found that "teachers were their own main resource in consultations for many of their decisions" (1971:102). He concluded:

> Although elementary teachers turn to many persons for help in unit planning and teaching, they almost invariably turn to three particular persons. These three persons stand apart from others in analysis of the data, both in number of times they were consulted and in that fourteen of fifteen teachers did consult with them at least once. Those three persons are the principal, or assistant principal, the fellow grade teacher and the librarian (1971:115).

In the general area of curriculum planning, teachers looked for help chiefly in content, methodology and materials, and did not seek much help in the assessment of student needs or interests, or in the evaluation of students.

In a recent similar survey completed in Alberta, Oberg (1975) examined the curriculum planning methods of 48 experienced and 12 prospective classroom teachers and found that when teachers consulted another person, the majority of these contacts were with fellow teachers.

Only in two studies were fellow teachers not named as the single most important source of assistance. The personnel named as their single most helpful source of assistance by seventy-five beginning teachers (Franc, 1970) were administrators, named by 30 percent of the teachers, colleagues, named by 25 percent, self, named by 17 percent, and supervisor, named by 12 percent.

Parsons (1971) asked six hundred and ninety-seven elementary teachers in West Central Ontario to identify and rate in effectiveness supervisory personnel who affected their classroom instruction. Principals were rated most influential and most effective, followed by other teachers, resource teachers, and program consultants. The importance of 'other teachers' to the participants in the study led Parsons to suggest (1971:8) that:

> in view of the effectiveness of 'other teachers' in helping staff members, it is recommended that greater opportunities be provided for teacher interaction in school systems by restructuring teacher roles. Teachers should be given greater freedom from their 'in-class' responsibilities to share new ideas and techniques with their colleagues.

Few studies have examined the teacher-consultant interaction itself. One study in this area, Heck (1972) examined teacher-peer interactions of 496 teachers from all grade levels to discover which characteristics of the interaction pattern reinforced or thwarted teacher growth in knowledge and operational resources areas. She divided reinforcing and thwarting responses into active/passive and positive/negative categories, and also divided teachers' perceptions of their peers into Significant Others and Non-significant Others. She concluded that when Significant Others reacted actively/positively on either operational or knowledge resource questions, they were perceived as reinforcing but when they reacted passively/negatively in either area they were perceived as thwarting. Non-significant Others were perceived as reinforcing when answering actively/positively on operational-resource questions and as thwarting when responding actively-negatively or passively-negatively in this area.

Identification of Teachers' Consultative Needs

Research in this area has been almost completely confined to the identification and analysis of the problems of first-year teachers.

After interviewing seventy-five beginning teachers, Franc

(1970) commented that one-third of all problems mentioned were in instruction, and that within this category, over 50 percent of problems were related to personal competence. In the area of interpersonal relationships, none of the respondents perceived problems with their colleagues but the teacher-administrator relationship was the greatest source of urgent concern.

Moller (1968) also found instructional problems to be an important concern of beginning teachers. He reported that their most serious problems were activities related to classroom instruction, student motivation, grading, meeting individual differences, discipline, working with low-ability students, finding a satisfactory speed for covering course materials, making satisfactory tests, lack of teaching creativity, and a tendency to 'talk over students' heads'.

Both McGillivray (1966) and Milne (1968) indicated that beginning teachers saw the development of appropriate teaching techniques and the handling of pupil motivation and discipline as their major problems.

In a study completed at the University of Pittsburgh, Farrell (1969) attempted to identify the professional problems of 1619 elementary teachers in an urban area. She found that the greatest emphasis was on meeting the specific needs of individual students in their classes.

In order to provide data for decisions about further education programs at the University of Utah, Ellis (1974) attempted to develop an instrument which would identify the educational needs of teachers. He found that "teachers perceived student attitudes as a major concern which correlated significantly with the highest priority need, 'teachers are unable to motivate students in the classroom'" (1974:104).

Research findings on problems experienced by first-year teachers show some consistency in the type of concern expressed. After reviewing literature in this area and conducting a number of studies on teacher concerns, Fuller and Parsons (1968) and Fuller (1969) suggested that different teacher concerns surface with length of teaching experience, although they themselves focused on pre-service and beginning teacher concerns. Kass (1975) further developed this idea and postulated a three-stage concern sequence for practicing teachers with self-adequacy concerns predominant in stage 1, content and methodology in stage 2, and concerns with individual student needs being uppermost in stage 3.

Harnack (1968:121) saw the improvement of teacher support services as being dependent on the teacher making his needs known to support staff. He noted that "research studies need to grow from . . . the teacher's need for help" (1968:26) and "the potential for improving these (supporting) services depends on teachers' suggestions" (1968:21).

Preliminary Study by Plamondon

Plamondon (1973), in the exploratory study on which this study is based, asked teachers in an Alberta school system to indicate the areas in which they would like to have consultative assistance available on request and for each area to choose from the following personnel: principal, assistant principal, department head, guidance personnel, librarian, another teacher, district office staff, Department of Education consultants, university personnel, and other resource personnel, the person whom they felt would best be able to provide this consultative assistance.

Findings indicated that over 80 percent of teachers would like to have consultative assistance available in the general area of student needs, and over 60 percent in curriculum and instructional methodology areas. In-school personnel were given first choice in all areas, with guidance personnel chosen in the area of student needs, department heads in curriculum and program development, and other teachers in instructional methodology.

The high percentage of response in the areas of student needs and curriculum and instructional methodology suggests that teachers felt their greatest need for assistance would be in these areas. The desire for readily available assistance in the area of student needs may suggest that teachers recognized their limitations in this area and also felt that problems in this area demanded instant attention.

The differentiation between the personnel chosen in curriculum and instructional methodology areas implies that teacher needs in these areas were very different, one perhaps reflecting knowledge about availability of resources while the other suggests the importance of the experienced teacher with the practical knowledge about instructional problems and techniques. Seventy-four percent of teachers were in favor of giving teachers of recognized ability, with no official administrative position, release time on a scheduled basis to provide consultative help, thus formalizing what may already be a well-established non-formal consultative network.

General Review of Studies on Consultation

From a general review of studies in these areas, Holdaway (1971:40) noted that only a small percentage of a school system's staff are consultants and that these people are unable to meet all the demands for their services, that principals have not enough expertise to provide the kind of specialist help required by teachers but are key figures in the provision of a supportive, facilitiating and motivating climate, and that the major task of the consultant should be to help teachers solve problems which they have identified.

Haughey (1972:27) added the following conclusions:

1. There is no clear distinction between the roles of the principal and other personnel with regard to supervision.

2. The conflicts in role expectations, the resistance to any type of evaluatory behavior, and the little time which principals have available, tend to make the availability of consultative assistance rather haphazard.

3. In-school personnel are most influential and effective in terms of consultative assistance. In particular, the effectiveness of 'other teachers' in providing consultative assistance was noted.

Plamondon (1973:27) in a similar survey asserted that (1) a need exists for more consultative assistance, (2) consultative assistance should be provided for problems perceived by teachers, and (3) in-school personnel are seen by teachers as most effective in providing consultative assistance.

Organizational Network of Schools

While the studies mentioned above have examined the consultation component of the school organization from the perspective of individual teachers, some other studies have considered the overall formal and informal structure. Miklos (1968:1) has criticised the lack of research particularly with regard to the informal structure and the interdependence between the formal and informal structures and individual characteristics. Studies dealing with the organizational network of schools have focused almost entirely on the relationship between the formal and informal networks in terms of influence and communication patterns.

The study of the school as a social system is relatively recent. In one of the first studies in this area, Boyan (1951) examined the formal and informal organization of a school faculty using questionnaires, interviews, and observation. He concluded that the informal network had an impact on the formal organization and considered that there was a relationship between the informal network and the willingness of the staff to accept changes in task requirements.

Iannaconne (1958) examined the social structure of a twenty-six teacher elementary school and found five distinct primary groups which linked to form two pyramids, each with an informal leader. Age, grade level taught, subject(s) area, room assignment and attitudes towards school policy were similar within sub-groups. He found that the formal and informal networks influenced each other.

Two studies completed at the University of Illinois examined the interrelationships between the formal organizational structure and the informal communication network of schools. Berner (1957) used two high school staffs as his population while Ross (1960) surveyed elementary school staffs. Both concluded that the informal pattern was affected by people active in the formal structure as well as by people active in informal socializing. Persons who were key figures in one activity tended also to be important in other areas. Administrators were prominent in the formal structure and if they were active in informal socializing, they could also be key figures in the informal communication network.

In a study of the influence structure in a Western Canadian high school, House (1966) examined the social structure and the communication, reliance, and attributed influence networks for twelve task areas. The social structure was found to be incongruent with the task-related influence network in a number of ways. The personnel found to be most influential had fewer social links, a finding also stressed by Bales and Slater (1955) and by Slater (1961). Bales and Slater (1955:305) pointed out the ambiguity surrounding the task specialist, commenting:

> He tends to be liked because he is satisfying needs in relation to the task area. But he also tends to arouse a certain amount of hostility because his prestige is rising relative to the other members, because he talks a large proportion of the time, and because his suggestions constitute proposed new elements to be added to the common culture, to which all members will be committed if they agree.

House did not find this ambivalence in all cases and this might have been due to the location of his study in a departmentalized high school. He (1966:241) noted:

> The communication, reliance, and attributed influence links on the twelve Task Topics tended to be between members having similar specialized work orientations, while the social links did not follow this tendency to the same extent . . . [yet] the two teachers who appeared to be the most influential teachers in matters pertaining directly to instruction, also were two of the main centres of social interaction.

Bezeau (1966) surveyed eighteen schools in Northern Central Alberta to examine the non-formal network, the pattern of interaction directed toward group goal achievement, and the informal network, the pattern of interaction directed toward the satisfaction of group needs. He found that teachers tended not to discuss matters related to the school and their teaching with the people in their social group, and that female teachers had a more accurate perception of their position within both networks than had male teachers.

Using the same data, Breitkreuz (1967) examined the characteristics of influential and non-influential staff members. Compared to non-influentials, influentials in the task-related dimensions tended to be older, male, to have more total teaching experience, to have taught longer in the present school, to have more years of teacher preparation, and to be teaching at higher grade levels. However, when classroom teachers who were classified as influentials were examined, he (Breitkreuz, 1967:107) found little similarity of characteristics.

> They tended to the extremes of the teaching force on the variables of age, sex, years of training, grade level taught, and length of experience in their present school.

Pettibone (1969) also analysed a New Mexico elementary school staff in terms of influentials. He found that influential teachers seemed to have influence on more than one dimension. Yet Stehno's (1971) results in a study of the formal and informal networks of three Kansas secondary schools indicated that formal relationships had little effect on informal relationships; sex and curriculum area were the predominant factors in determining informal group membership.

Charters (1969) used McCleary's (1957) data on the formal and informal networks of an Illinois high school. He added data gathered from five small elementary schools in St. Louis to examine the stability of the structure of person-to-person communication. He found that staff in small schools not only were more in contact with each other but also had greater frequency of contact. The cut-off point, he considered, was twelve or thirteen. Up to that level everyone talked with everyone else, but beyond it, sub-groups tended to form. This may be influenced to some extent by factors such as physical distance from the staff room and the introduction of specialists.

After analysis of data collected in one elementary school in New York over a four and one-half year period, Rubin (1965) asserted that certain formally prescribed activities within the school, such as the principal's designation of room, floor and grade assignments, his prescriptions of duty schedules, music instruction, physical education and other such schedules, influenced the pattern of informal interaction especially where conditions did not permit free interaction, as in the absence of afternoon recess for grade one teachers.

Thomas (1974) examined the effectiveness and efficiency of the informal communication structure of four elementary schools in a British Columbia school system and compared them to the age of the school. He found that the informal communication structures were less efficient although not less effective as the schools increased in age. Effectiveness referred to the extent to which informal leaders, mutual choices and isolates occurred in the network, while efficiency was determined by the number of power iterations necessary to obtain a saturation figure of fifty percent, i.e. the number of go-betweens necessary to communicate informally with at least 50 percent of the staff.

Yarnall (1970) had similar results in his study of five team-teaching elementary schools in Florida which varied in length of existence from one to seven years. He found that the percentage of each staff that comprised its mutual choice sociogram decreased from forty-nine percent at a new school to eighteen percent at the oldest school. This, he found, was unrelated to the extent of advice-seeking, for as the ages of the team-teaching schools increased, newer teachers and older teachers increasingly sought the advice of each other. Greenberger and Sorenson (1967:15) also concluded from their study of the informal social organization of a junior-high school that "the mutual friendship choices do not have any significant effect on mutual choices in the areas of teaching skills and advice."

The lack of conclusive evidence on the relationship between formal and informal networks and on the characteristics of influentials on task dimensions and their position in the social structure may be due in part to the varying definitions used in the studies cited. Since the administrative staff were named as influentials in all studies, the characteristics of influential teachers are unclear. Most studies used loosely defined task areas, for example, matters related to instruction and teaching, which may include several network patterns within the general response. However, the studies do indicate that there is a non-formal, task-related network in schools which may or may not overlap the informal, social needs network.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The essential reasoning behind this study lies in the following statement: People are motivated to satisfy their needs through action in order to maintain their internal consistency and enhance their feelings of competence, worth, and belonging, generally referred to as self-esteem.

When people react to a need they tend to do so for one of two basic reasons--they wish to avoid a feeling of failure and possibly its attendant guilt or to seek success and a feeling of satisfaction. The avoidance desire is externally motivated, so that individuals acting from this base are trying to develop a safe environment to maintain their belongingness and to prevent any attention being called to themselves and what they perceive as an inadequacy.

People seeking success are motivated from a personal desire for improvement. They may be trying to minimize the unknowns in their environment but they also seek success and satisfaction from their work.

The search for needs-satisfaction is a recurring one since needs are only satisfied momentarily. The search itself is influenced by two factors: expectancy and availability. Expectancy theory suggests that motivation or effort to perform is a multiplicative function of the probability of receiving the desired answer and the importance of that answer to the individual. Expectancy is based on past experience. Availability refers to how the individual perceives his environment and the accessibility of his goal. The relative potency of needs is also important since individuals will only seek answers to only those problems that are most pressing for them.

The hierarchy most often used to rank needs was developed by Maslow (1943). He categorized human needs into five broad groups described by Schneider and Alderfer (1973:489):

> Physiological needs include the classic drives, hunger, thirst and sex as well as sensory needs such as taste, smell, and touch. Safety needs include physical illness, surgery, quarrelling parents, and separation; while belongingness needs are shown when a person misses his friends, sweetheart, wife, or place in his group. Esteem needs concern each person's desire for a stable and high evaluation of himself. In Maslow's view, this self-esteem is healthy when it is based upon deserved (italics his) respect from others for real competence and capacity. Maslow (1954:92) defines self-actualization needs in a number of ways; perhaps his position is best summarized as "the desire to become more and more what one is capable of becoming."

Using a questionnaire based on a hierarchy of needs developed by Porter (1963:386-397) from Maslow's original taxonomy (1954), Sergiovanni and Carver (1971:103) surveyed 233 principals and teachers and found that the greatest need deficiency was in the area of esteem, defined as the desire for self-respect, for respect by others as a person and as a professional, for competence, for confidence and for recognition. They interpreted this result as meaning that teachers in general, and younger teachers in particular, felt professionally unsure of themselves, doubted their professional competence or felt uncertain about how other more established professionals regarded their competence. They also found that teachers in the 45 and over age group reported the smallest need deficiencies but expected less in terms of needs fulfilment.

Esteem, as defined by Porter and Maslow, has two dimensions, the concept of self adequacy and that of professional competence. The latter dimension is expressed by teachers as a desire for job mastery and professional growth. This desire matched with a positive self-concept may lead teachers to overcome problems by calling not only on their own ability but also on the advice of those colleagues whom they perceive to be competent. This, in turn, can lead to a richer self-image and increased self-awareness. Teachers who hold a poor self-image of themselves and are afraid to risk their skills and abilities against the problems of the job tend not to raise their level of professional competence.

A poor self-image resulting in fear and uncertainty is one of the major forces for resistance to change (Lippett, 1967). Reassurance and encouragement from a peer can result in job success which, in turn, broadens the self-concept and opens the way for acceptance of further change.

The factors which [illegible]vide opportunities for professional growth, achievement, recognition, and responsibility have been termed satisfiers by Herzberg and his associates (1959). These are similar to the three higher need dimensions delineated by Porter and Maslow, esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization. They are attained through task accomplishment rather than social interaction. In fact, Sergiovanni and Carver (1972:10-31) noted that social needs, the desire for acceptance, belonging, friendship, and school membership in the formal and informal work groups, were relatively unimportant to the respondents in their study discussed previously. The daily role performance of teachers takes place in isolated classrooms, a phenomenon Miles (1965:24) referred to as "role performance invisibility." Yet while teachers have little opportunity to display their skills and techniques before colleagues, they desire their peers to regard them positively as competent professionals.

Dubin (1961:65) makes a clear distinction between the formal structure of the organization, the non-formal structure which is composed of the functional relationships through which the organizational tasks are accomplished, and the informal structure which is formed through voluntary association to meet the needs of its members. The non-formal and in-formal structures may or may not be congruent and may or may not be related. Sergiovanni and Starratt (1971:189) suggest that:

> Interaction effectiveness tends not to be potent enough, however, to provide the kinds of rewards that nourish professional individuals. Professionals tend to need and actively seek the kinds of satisfaction that only task effectiveness (activity which promotes, defines, clarifies, pursues, and accomplishes relevant school goals) can bring.

It is generally accepted that the knowledge and skills learned in pre-service teacher education are of themselves inadequate to solve all the day-to-day problems facing a teacher. Hence, it is no wonder that many teachers feel unsure about their own professional competence. Job mastery and professional growth are constantly tested in the classroom situation. Teachers desire and need consultative assistance in order to solve recurring problems, to experience success and to grow professionally. If it is unavailable in the formal organization they may seek it through a non-formal network.

SUMMARY

Consultation has been defined from two perspectives; the 'defects' approach where other personnel decide in what areas teachers are inadequately prepared and impose a program for change, usually through group in-service meetings, and the 'growth' approach where teachers delineate their problems and choose the means and ends for their professional growth. The primary vehicle for the latter approach is individual consultation.

Teachers have long considered the numbers of consultative personnel available as inadequate and have turned to their colleagues as the major source of assistance. The principal has been regarded both as the most important single source of assistance and as the least source of help. Colleagues rate highly in the provision of consultative assistance and can contribute significantly to an individual's professional growth.

Teachers want most assistance in the area of student needs and beginning teachers stress self-adequacy concerns.

Research on the informal organization of the school and any relationship to the formal organization suggests that there is a relationship, that one influences the other, that personnel high in one network are usually high in both, that administrators often do not figure highly on the informal network and hence limit their influence, that many organizational factors impinge on the networks, and that as schools enlarge their staffs and increase in age the informal network becomes subdivided and is less efficient.

The conceptual framework of the study is based on the competency needs theory where a desire to change, improve, or protect a position encourages a person to seek assistance.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH DESIGN

The research methodology of the study is presented in this chapter. It is discussed in terms of the research instrument, data collection procedures, the treatment of the data, and the delimitations and assumptions of the design.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

A questionnaire and an interview schedule were devised to obtain the data for the study.

Choice of Instruments

A questionnaire was used as the preliminary survey instrument for the following reasons:

1. It would provide the data on which the interview was based.
2. It would make the participants aware of the topics to be discussed at the interview, and
3. It would provide data that were too cumbersome or time-consuming, to be obtained orally.

The interview was used to clarify and elaborate on the written responses in the questionnaire. By allowing the interviewer to probe the reasons behind responses and for resultant actions and non-actions, it provided the opportunity to determine the exact nature of task problems, and obtain information orally which the interviewee might be unwilling to write owing to time pressures or for personal reasons.

Instrumentation

The questionnaire which was constructed by the researcher was divided into three sections.

Part 1 contained three sociometric questions. Using a List of Personnel which allocated a number to each teacher, the respondent was asked to ring the numbers of those teachers whom he regarded as members of his social group, whom he associated with socially outside school time, and with whom he had had any major disagreement.

Part 2 provided a list of 21 consultative task areas under four major headings, curriculum and program, instructional, audio-visual technology, and special student needs. Teachers were asked to indicate by use of check marks if they had desired assistance in each task area and whether this had occurred more than once during the school year.

Part 3 asked for personal data including sex, number of complete years of post-secondary education, number of years of teaching experience (a) in total, (b) in the school system, and (c) in their present school; consistency of preparation with teaching assignment; grade level(s) taught; and present position in the school.

The interview schedule contained what the interviewer said to each respondent. It was divided into:

1. introduction,
2. definition of parameters of interview,

3. questions asked concerning each task area,
4. questions asked concerning the sociometric questions,
5. questions asked concerning their own provision of consultative assistance,
6. provision for respondent to question interviewer, and
7. closing statement.

The interview answer sheets were made up of three sections.

Part 1 dealt with the following information for each task area discussed:

1. specific concerns,
2. time of occurrence,
3. people consulted, and
4. rating of assistance received from each consultant.

Part 2 contained data on the following questions.

1. Reasons for choice in sociometric question 1,
2. whether they also consulted these choices,
3. form of socialization with choices in sociometric question 2,
4. nature of disagreements with choices in sociometric question 3,
5. whether this prevented subsequent consultation.

Part 3 dealt with the provision of consultative assistance, namely:

1. to whom they provided assistance,
2. in which areas they provided assistance, and
3. frequency of provision of assistance.

Validity of Instruments

The questionnaire was based on that used by Plamondon (1973). From the task areas listed in that questionnaire, those not related specifically to teacher-teacher interaction were eliminated, as were all those for which less than 50 percent of respondents indicated a desire to have consultative assistance available. The only exception was in the interpretation of Department of Education curriculum guides which is closely related to developing course outlines. The original questionnaire asked about using curriculum guides and only 28 percent of teachers desired to have assistance available on request. The remaining task areas were then grouped into four general categories, curriculum and program, instructional, audio-visual technology and special student needs. General statements, for example, "Using a variety of instructional techniques and approaches" were made more specific.

In order to ensure that the questions were valid, clear and unambiguous, the questionnaire and interview schedule were distributed to people with various teaching backgrounds, including:

1. five practicing teachers,
2. three staff and five students in the Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, and
3. the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and three principals in the participating school system.

After amendments, the questionnaire was distributed to four elementary teachers in another school in the same system not participating in the study. Interviews using the schedule and answer sheets were completed with these teachers.

DATA-COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Permission was obtained from the Superintendent and the three school principals involved to introduce the study and distribute the questionnaires at their December, 1973 staff meetings. Participation by each teacher was voluntary and teachers preferred that no tape-recorder be used at the interviews.

Each teacher was given a List of Personnel which allocated a code number to each staff member, a questionnaire, and an envelope, to return, sealed if they wished, to the principal. Teachers read through the questionnaire at the staff meeting and all were asked to code their own questionnaire and envelope with their own number and the code number for the school. Questionnaires were collected from the principals at the beginning of January, 1974 and arrangements made for individual interviews with their staffs. Since there was a hundred percent return in all three schools, the complete population was interviewed. Interviews were conducted with the 80 teachers during the mid-January to mid-February period. Interviews were scheduled to last for 60 minutes, but individual interviews ranged in length from twenty minutes to an hour and were conducted in a specifically allocated room in the school.

Each principal and assistant principal was also asked for a description of the school's formal consultation network, the duties of the principal and assistant principal, and whether there were any teaching teams on staff.

TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The data from the instruments were sorted, examined, coded, and transferred onto computer cards. Sociometric matrices were obtained for the sociometric data, and frequencies and percentages computed for all task dimensions. Where appropriate, independent variables were examined by all dependent variables, and in some cases chi-square distributions were recorded. Matrices of all task area interactions were also constructed.

DELIMITATIONS, ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Delimitations

The study was confined to the elementary teachers employed in three schools in one school system in Alberta.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the information obtained from the respondents was accurate, that the task areas specified covered all major areas of concern and that the data collection and analysis techniques used accurately reflected the respondents' perceptions.

Limitations

Since information was limited to that given by teachers in one school system, the results may not have applicability for other school systems, other schools, or teachers in other grade levels. Notwithstanding this limitation, statistical procedures have been used to focus on particular aspects of the data analysis.

SUMMARY

A questionnaire and follow-up interview were used to obtain information from a population of 80 teachers, the staff of three elementary schools in one school system, concerning their desire for consultative assistance.

Computer analysis of the data provided frequency and percentage frequency distributions of all responses in each task area. Comparisons between responses when distributed according to certain dependent variables, and where appropriate, the chi-square test for probability distribution, were obtained. Sociometric matrices and task area matrices were also derived and combined from the data.

Chapter 4.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS AND THEIR SCHOOLS

The background characteristics of the teacher respondents in the study, the administrative organization of the school system and the formal consultative pattern for each school are included in this chapter.

DESCRIPTION OF THE RESPONDENTS

The study examined the responses of 80 teachers, the staffs of three schools. The characteristics of this population in total and by school are given in Table 1.

Overall, 76 percent of the population were female and 24 percent were male. When examined by school, School 1 had the highest proportion of male teachers, while School 3 had the highest proportion of female teachers.

When examined by years of post-secondary education, School 2 had the highest percentage of teachers with less than four years of training (42 percent), while School 3 had the lowest (23 percent). Sixty-four percent of teachers in School 3 had four years of post-secondary education, and overall, the staff of School 3 was the most highly qualified staff of the three schools.

School 3 staff members were also the staff with the most years of teaching experience. Over 55 percent of the teachers in School 3 had more than 10 years of teaching experience and 23 percent had

Table 1

Percentage Distribution of Characteristics of Respondents in Total and by School

	Total N=80 %	School 1 N=34 %	School 2 N=24 %	School 3 N=22 %
SEX				
Female	76.3	70.6	79.2	81.8
Male	23.8	29.4	20.8	18.2
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
YEARS OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION				
1 - 2 yrs.	12.5	8.8	16.7	13.6
3 "	21.3	26.5	25.0	9.1
4 "	48.8	44.1	41.7	63.6
5 - 6 "	17.5	20.6	16.7	13.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
TOTAL YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE				
1 - 3 yrs.	31.3	38.2	41.7	9.1
4 - 6 "	22.5	23.5	20.8	22.7
7 - 10 "	13.8	20.6	4.2	13.6
11 - 20 "	23.7	17.7	25.0	31.8
21 + "	8.8	0.0	8.3	22.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
YEARS EMPLOYED BY THE SCHOOL SYSTEM				
1 yr.	22.5	32.4	25.0	4.6
2 - 5 yrs.	47.5	47.1	45.8	50.0
6 + "	30.0	20.6	29.2	45.5
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
YEARS EMPLOYED IN THE SCHOOL				
1 yr.	40.0	61.8	33.3	13.6
2 yrs.	27.5	23.5	29.2	31.8
3 - 10 yrs.	32.5	14.7	37.5	54.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=63	N=28	N=18	N=17
GRADE DIVISION				
Div. 1	54.0	53.6	44.4	64.7
Div. 2	46.0	46.4	55.6	35.3
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	N=80	N=34	N=24	N=22
FORMAL POSITION				
Teachers	86.3	88.2	83.3	86.4
Others	13.8	11.8	16.7	13.6
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

been employed as teachers for at least twenty years. In comparison, 42 percent of teachers in School 2 were in their first three years of teaching.

School 1 had the largest influx of new teachers (62 percent) and teachers new to the school system (32 percent), while School 3 had the fewest new staff (14 percent) and only 5 percent were in their first year in the school system.

While more teachers in School 2 (56 percent) taught in Division 2 (Gr. 4-6) than in Division 1, the reverse was true for Schools 1 and 3. School 3 had 65 percent of its staff teaching in Division 1 since the school did not include grade 6 classes.

When examined by formal position, over 80 percent of the population in each school were classroom teachers, with the highest percentage (88 percent) being in School 1. Correspondingly, this school had the lowest percentage of "Other positions."

ORGANIZATION OF THE SCHOOL SYSTEM

The school system employed 141 teachers in five schools--three elementary, an elementary-junior-high school, and a junior-senior high school.

The central office personnel were the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and a Director of Guidance.

Each elementary school had an administrative team of a principal and assistant principal. In Schools 1 and 2 part-time guidance counsellors were employed, while in School 3, this function was performed by the assistant principal. Each school had a full-time librarian and a resource teacher.

FORMAL CONSULTATION ORGANIZATION

All principals employed an open-door policy towards consultation. Teachers with consultative concerns could visit the principal and discuss these concerns with him. All principals visited teachers on a casual basis, making formal visits for evaluation and certification purposes only. However, within this framework, each principal organized other consultation activities somewhat differently.

School 1

The timetable in this school was organized to give all teachers teaching in the same grade level a preparation period together once every six days. This time was for teacher-peer consultation, planning together, and developing materials. The principal and assistant principal attended the first meeting when a grade coordinator was chosen, but they did not attend subsequent meetings.

Other small group meetings convened during lunch hour to discuss curriculum matters in particular subject areas. These were usually organized by the Assistant Superintendent and often attended by teachers from the other schools.

School 2

At the beginning of the school year, two groups were formed to discuss problems and improvements in the two major subject areas, Mathematics/Science and Language Arts/Social Studies. Teachers opted to join either group and meetings were held during lunch hours. Both groups were chaired by the principal. They met irregularly between September and December, and after listing the concepts to be taught at each grade level, teacher interest waned. In Language Arts, the teachers adopted the list of concepts developed at School 1. No other formally organized meetings were planned.

School 3

Each grade level met once a month to discuss a variety of topics. The agenda was put on the staff notice board prior to the meeting and minutes were kept. Each grade level chose a chairman. These meetings were attended by the principal and assistant principal and often items referred to them from the general staff meeting were discussed.

SUMMARY

The background characteristics of the teachers, the organization of the school system and the formal consultative pattern for each school were described in this chapter.

Overall, 76 percent of the population were female, 66 percent had at least four years of post-secondary education, 54 percent were in their first six years of teaching experience, 40 percent were in their first year in their present school, 70 percent had taught for the school system for less than six years, 54 percent taught in Division 1 and 86 percent were classroom teachers.

The entire school system included five schools and employed 141 teachers. Central Office personnel included the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and a Director of Guidance.

Schools varied in their organization of the consultative function. School 1 used grade level meetings once every six days, School 2 inaugurated two subject area core groups who met under the chairmanship of the principal and in School 3, grade meetings attended by both the principal and assistant principal were held on a monthly basis.

Chapter 5

TASK AREAS SELECTED BY TEACHERS

The distribution of responses to Problem 1 for all teachers in the study is presented in this chapter. Problem 1 asked:

"In which task areas and at what period of the school year, did teachers desire consultative assistance?"

SUB-PROBLEM 1.1

Statement. "How many teachers desired assistance in each task area?"

Table 2 presents the percentage responses of teachers for each task area. The highest percentages of teachers indicating a desire for consultative assistance were in the Special Student Needs task areas.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Seventy-three percent of teachers wanted consultative assistance with "Selecting instructional materials," and 55 percent indicated concerns in the task area "Developing course outlines." Forty-eight percent of teachers indicated a desire for assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans," and "Developing instructional materials." Help in "Evaluating lesson/unit plans" was sought by 28 percent of teachers while only 16 percent desired assistance in "Interpreting curriculum guides."

Table 2

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area

No.	TASK AREA Description	Teachers %
	CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM	
1.	Developing course outlines	55.0*
2.	Selecting instructional materials	72.5
3.	Developing unit/lesson plans	47.5
4.	Developing instructional materials	47.5
5.	Evaluating lessons/units	27.5
6.	Interpreting curriculum guides	16.3
	INSTRUCTIONAL	
7.	Developing questioning techniques	13.8
8.	Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	35.0
9.	Planning role-playing	15.0
10.	Developing/using small group activities	35.0
11.	Planning individualized instruction	46.3
12.	Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	13.8
13.	Leading discussions	11.3
14.	Grouping for instruction	35.0
	AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY	
15.	Operating audio-visual equipment	63.8
16.	Using kits, charts, games, simulations	35.0
17.	Developing own audio-visual materials	22.5
	SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS	
18.	Diagnosis of learning difficulties	85.0
19.	Developing remedial programs	75.0
20.	Obtaining student-background information	53.8
21.	Solving teacher-pupil problems	51.3
	N	80
		100.0

*55 percent of the 80 teachers in the study desired consultative assistance in task area 1, Developing course outlines.

Instructional task areas. No task area in this section was of concern to the majority of teachers. Forty-six percent of teachers desired assistance in "Planning individualized instruction," 35 percent in "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," "Developing/using small-group activities," and "Grouping for instruction," with smaller percentages indicating the other task areas.

Audio-visual Technology task areas. In this section 64 percent of teachers desired assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment." While 35 percent wanted information on "Using kits, charts, games, simulations," a smaller percentage of teachers (22 percent) sought help in "Developing own audio-visual materials."

Special Student Needs task areas. Eighty-five percent of teachers expressed difficulties in the area "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and 75 percent had concerns in "Developing remedial programs." Just over half of the teachers desired assistance in "Obtaining student-background information" and "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

SUB-PROBLEM 1.2

Statement. "To what extent were differences in teachers' specification of consultative task areas associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in the school system,

4. years of employment in their present school,
5. grade division, and
6. formal position in the school?"

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

When responses indicating teacher concerns in each task area were examined on the basis of years of post-secondary education (Table 3), a greater number of teachers with three or more years of post-secondary education desired assistance than did teachers with fewer years of post-secondary education.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Few teachers with 1-2 years of post-secondary education desired assistance in these task areas, with the exception of "Selecting instructional materials" where 70 percent desired assistance and "Developing unit/lesson plans," an area indicated by 40 percent.

In comparison, over 50 percent of teachers with three or more years of post-secondary education desired assistance in "Developing course outlines," and "Selecting instructional materials." Fifty-nine percent of those with three years and 54 percent of those with four years of post-secondary education wanted assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans" while this area was indicated by only 21 percent of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education. "Developing instructional materials" was indicated by 77 percent of teachers with three years of post-secondary education but by less than 50 percent of those with four and five to six years of post-secondary education. Fewer than 50 percent of teachers in any category desired assistance in the remaining areas.

Table 3

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Post-Secondary Education

TASK AREA No. Description	Years of Post-Secondary Education 1-2 %	 3 %	 4 %	 5-6 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM				
1. Developing course outlines	30.0	58.8	59.0	57.1
2. Selecting instructional materials	70.0	82.4	62.2	71.4
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	40.0	58.8	53.9	21.4
4. Developing instructional materials	10.0	76.5	48.7	35.7
5. Evaluating lessons/units	10.0	41.2	25.6	28.6
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	10.0	11.8	20.5	14.3
INSTRUCTIONAL				
7. Developing questioning techniques	10.0	5.9	15.4	21.4
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	30.0	47.1	33.3	28.6
9. Planning role-playing	10.0	29.4	12.8	7.1
10. Developing/using small group activities	20.0	52.9	38.5	14.3
11. Planning individualized instruction	20.0	76.5	46.2	28.6
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/ discovery method	0.0	23.5	12.8	14.3
13. Leading discussions	0.0	17.7	12.8	7.1
14. Grouping for instruction	20.0	35.3	38.5	35.7
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY				
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	70.0	70.6	59.0	64.3
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	10.0	47.1	38.5	28.6
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	10.0	35.3	15.4	35.7
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS				
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	90.0	88.2	84.6	78.6
19. Developing remedial programs	70.0	94.1	76.9	50.0
20. Obtaining student-background information	40.0	76.5	46.2	57.1
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	50.0	52.9	56.4	35.7
N	10 100.0	17 100.0	39 100.0	14 100.0

Instructional task areas. More teachers with three years of post-secondary education desired assistance in this section than did any other group. In two task areas, "Grouping for instruction" and "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," there was little differentiation on years of post-secondary education, while the other task areas were most often indicated by teachers with three and four years of post-secondary education. "Planning individualized instruction" was indicated by 77 percent of three year qualified teachers while only 46 percent of those with four years of post-secondary education desired assistance in this area. Two areas "Using the problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method" and "Leading discussions" were not indicated by any teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education.

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. Except in the area "Operating audio-visual equipment" where over 59 percent of teachers in each category sought assistance, more teachers with three or more years of post-secondary education desired assistance in "Using kits, charts, games, simulations" and "Making own audio-visual materials."

Special Student Needs task areas. Over 77 percent of teachers in all categories desired assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and except for teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education, over 70 percent desired assistance in "Developing remedial programs." More teachers with three years of post-secondary education (77 percent) than in other categories

(40-57 percent) sought assistance in "Obtaining student-background information." Only 36 percent of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education indicated "Solving teacher-pupil problems" while over 50 percent of teachers in each of the other categories desired assistance.

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Table 4 presents the responses of teachers classified by total years of teaching experience. Teachers with over ten years of teaching experience had less desire for consultative assistance than had teachers with fewer years of teaching experience.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Sixty-eight percent of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience and 72 percent of those with four to six years of teaching experience desired assistance in "Developing course outlines." Smaller percentages of teachers with more years of teaching experience sought assistance in "Selecting instructional materials." Over 70 percent of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience and 60 percent of those with seven to ten years of teaching experience desired assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans."

Instructional task areas. Teachers with over twenty years of teaching experience did not desire assistance in any instructional task area except "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method." Teachers with eleven to twenty years of experience were also selective, with 47 percent desiring assistance in "Planning individualized

Table 4

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in
Each Task Area, by Total Years of Teaching Experience

TASK AREA No. Description	Total Years of Teaching Experience 1-3 %	 4-6 %	 7-10 %	 11-20 %	 Over 20 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM					
1. Developing course outlines	68.0	72.2	54.6	31.6	28.6
2. Selecting instructional materials	80.0	77.8	90.9	52.6	57.1
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	72.0	44.4	63.6	21.1	14.3
4. Developing instructional materials	72.0	44.4	45.5	31.6	14.3
5. Evaluating lessons/units	36.0	33.3	27.3	15.8	14.3
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	28.0	11.1	27.3	5.3	0.0
INSTRUCTIONAL					
7. Developing questioning techniques	20.0	22.2	18.2	0.0	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	44.0	44.4	18.2	36.8	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	20.0	22.2	18.2	5.3	0.0
10. Developing/using small group activities	44.0	33.3	54.6	26.3	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	44.0	50.0	72.7	47.4	0.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	8.0	27.8	9.1	10.5	14.3
13. Leading discussions	28.0	5.6	9.1	0.0	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	40.0	44.4	45.5	26.3	0.0
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY					
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	34.0	66.7	63.6	42.1	42.9
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	56.0	38.9	36.4	15.8	0.0
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	36.0	22.2	27.3	0.0	28.6
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS					
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	84.0	77.8	100.0	89.5	71.4
19. Developing remedial programs	84.0	61.1	90.9	84.2	28.6
20. Obtaining student-background information	64.0	55.6	72.7	36.8	28.6
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	52.0	44.4	81.8	42.1	42.9
	N 25 100.0	18 100.0	11 100.0	19 100.0	7 100.0

instruction," 37 percent in "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," and 26 percent in "Developing/using small group activities" and "Grouping for instruction." They desired no assistance in "Developing questioning techniques," and "Leading discussions."

Seventy-three percent of teachers with seven to ten years of teacher experience sought assistance in "Planning individualized instruction," and 54 percent in "Developing/using small group activities." Smaller percentages indicated a desire for assistance in the other task areas.

Over 20 percent of teachers with one to three and four to six years of teaching experience sought assistance in all task areas in this section. The exceptions were for teachers with one to three years of teaching experience, "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method" (8 percent), and for those in the four to six years category, "Leading discussions" (6 percent). Over 40 percent of teachers in these two categories desired assistance in "Planning role-playing," "Planning individualized instruction," and "Grouping for instruction."

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. Eighty-four percent of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience, 64 percent of those in the four to six years and seven to ten years categories, and 42 percent of those with more years of experience desired assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment."

The percentages of teachers desiring assistance in "Using kits, charts, games, simulations" decreased with years of teaching experience from 56 percent for those with one to three years of teaching experience to none in the over twenty years of experience category.

Over 22 percent of teachers in all categories except that for teachers with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience, and 36 percent of those in their first three years of teaching experience desired assistance in "Developing own audio-visual materials."

Special Student Needs task areas. Over 70 percent of teachers in each category desired assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" as did all teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience. "Developing remedial programs" was also a concern of over 60 percent of teachers in all categories except that for teachers with over twenty years of teaching experience of whom only 29 percent desired assistance in this area.

More teachers with less than eleven years of teaching experience (56 percent) than teachers in other categories, sought assistance in "Obtaining student-background information." Fifty-two percent of those with one to three years of teaching experience and 82 percent of those with seven to ten years of teaching experience sought assistance in "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School System

The distribution of responses classified by length of time employed by the school system is shown in Table 5. In general the percentage of teachers desiring consultative assistance decreased as years of employment in the school system increased.

Curriculum and Program task areas. When teachers' responses were examined according to length of employment in the school system a higher percentage of teachers in their first year of employment in the

Table 5

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in School System

TASK AREA No. Description	Years of Employment in School System 1 %	 2-5 %	 6-12 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM			
1. Developing course outlines	66.7	60.5	37.5
2. Selecting instructional materials	83.3	73.7	62.5
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	61.1	50.0	33.3
4. Developing instructional materials	66.7	47.4	33.3
5. Evaluating lessons/units	27.8	34.2	16.7
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	27.8	15.8	8.3
INSTRUCTIONAL			
7. Developing questioning techniques	5.6	23.7	4.2
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	50.0	31.6	29.2
9. Planning role-playing	11.1	18.4	12.5
10. Developing/using small group activities	61.1	34.2	16.7
11. Planning individualized instruction	50.0	50.0	37.5
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	16.7	15.8	8.3
13. Leading discussions	11.1	15.8	4.2
14. Grouping for instruction	38.9	34.2	33.3
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY			
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	77.8	76.3	33.3
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	50.0	42.1	12.5
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	27.8	23.7	16.7
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS			
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	72.2	84.2	95.8
19. Developing remedial programs	72.2	79.0	70.8
20. Obtaining student-background information	66.7	52.6	45.8
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	50.0	50.0	54.2
N	18 100.0	38 100.0	24 100.0

school system desired assistance in all areas except "Evaluating lessons/ units" which was indicated by 28 percent of new teachers and by 34 percent of those with two to five years of employment in the school system.

Instructional task areas. Over 50 percent of teachers new to the school system desired assistance in "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," "Planning individualized instruction" and Developing/using small group activities," while only one area was indicated by 50 percent of teachers with two to five years of employment, "Planning individualized instruction."

The task area indicated by the greatest percentage of teachers with 6 to 12 years of employment in the school system (38 percent) was "Planning individualized instruction."

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. The same trend of decreasing concerns with increasing years of employment in the school system was evident from teachers' responses in this task area. The decrease in percentage of teachers indicating concerns between those with two to five years of employment and those with six to twelve years of employment in the school system was particularly marked. Seventy-six percent of teachers who had been employed by the school system for two to five years desired assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment," an area indicated by only 33 percent of teachers in the six to twelve years category.

Special Student Needs task areas. In two areas, "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Developing remedial programs," over 71 percent of teachers in each category desired assistance. Percentages in these task areas did not reflect a decrease in concerns with increasing years of employment in the school system.

Sixty-seven percent of new teachers sought assistance in "Obtaining student-background information," as did 46 percent of teachers who had been employed by the school system for at least six years. Approximately 50 percent of teachers in each category had concerns in "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School

There was no easily recognizable trend in percentage of concerns when classified by years of employment in their present school (Table 6). In a number of cases, there was little difference in the percentages of teachers indicating concerns.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Overall, while the percentage of teachers in the three to ten years category was lower for each task area than the percentages in the other categories, the differences between percentages were not large. Fifty-nine percent of teachers in their first and second year of teaching in the school desired assistance in "Developing course outlines" and this area was mentioned by 46 percent of those teaching for more than two years in the school. However, in "Interpreting curriculum guides" there was a definite drop in concerns from 25 percent of those in their first year to 8 percent of those in the three to ten years category.

Table 6

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in Present School

TASK AREA No. Description	Years of Employment in Present School 1 %	 2 %	 3-10 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM			
1. Developing course outlines	59.4	59.1	46.2
2. Selecting instructional materials	81.3	68.2	65.4
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	58.3	45.5	38.5
4. Developing instructional materials	56.3	54.6	30.8
5. Evaluating lessons/units	25.0	36.4	23.1
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	25.0	13.6	7.7
INSTRUCTIONAL			
7. Developing questioning techniques	6.3	31.8	7.7
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	40.6	31.8	30.8
9. Planning role-playing	9.4	22.7	15.4
10. Developing/using small group activities	43.8	31.8	26.9
11. Planning individualized instruction	43.8	45.5	50.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	12.5	13.6	15.4
13. Leading discussions	9.4	27.3	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	40.6	36.4	26.9
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY			
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	75.0	63.6	50.0
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	40.6	50.0	15.4
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	28.1	9.1	26.9
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS			
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	81.3	86.4	88.5
19. Developing remedial programs	75.0	86.4	65.4
20. Obtaining student-background information	65.6	45.5	46.2
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	56.3	59.1	38.5
N	32 100.0	22 100.0	26 100.0

Instructional task areas. More teachers in their first year in the school desired assistance in "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations" (40 percent), "Developing/using small group activities" (44 percent), and "Grouping for instruction" (41 percent) than did teachers with more years of employment in the school.

The reverse trend was evident in "Planning individualized instruction" and "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method," where more teachers in the three to ten years category than in other categories, desired assistance. In "Developing course outlines" (32 percent), "Planning role-playing" (23 percent), and "Leading discussions" (27 percent) the highest percentages were from teachers in their second year in the school.

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. The percentage of teachers desiring assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment" decreased from 75 percent to 50 percent as years of employment in the school increased. Over 44 percent of teachers in their first or second year in the school desired assistance in "Using kits, charts, games, simulations," while only 9 percent sought assistance in "Developing own audio-visual materials." In contrast, over 26 percent of teachers new to the school and those with three to ten years of employment in the school sought assistance in this area.

Special Student Needs task areas. Over 80 percent of teachers in each category desired assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" with the highest percentage (89 percent) from teachers with three to ten years of employment in the school. In "Developing remedial programs," 86 percent of teachers in their second year in the school sought assistance while slightly fewer teachers with more years of employment in the school (65 percent) indicated this area. "Obtaining student-background information" was indicated by 66 percent of teachers new to the school and 46 percent of those with two and with three to ten years of employment in the school. Approximately 56 percent of teachers in their first or second year in the school sought assistance in "Solving teacher-pupil problems" while only 39 percent of those with three to ten years of employment in the school desired assistance in this area.

Responses Classified by Grade Division

When responses indicating the number of teachers with concerns in each task area were divided on the basis of grade division (Table 7), the concerns of Division 1 teachers differed from those of Division 2 teachers in a number of areas.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Similar percentages of Division 1 and Division 2 teachers desired assistance in "Developing course outlines" (55 percent) and "Developing instructional materials" (48 percent). Slightly higher percentages of Division 1 than Division 2 teachers sought assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans," "Evaluating lessons/units," and "Interpreting curriculum guides," while more Division 2 teachers desired assistance in "Selecting instructional materials."

Table 7

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Grade Division

TASK AREA No.	Description	Grade Division 1 (Gr.1-3) %	 2 (Gr.4-6) %
	CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1.	Developing course outlines	55.9	55.2
2.	Selecting instructional materials	70.6	86.2
3.	Developing unit/lesson plans	64.7	44.8
4.	Developing instructional materials	52.9	48.3
5.	Evaluating lessons/units	35.3	24.1
6.	Interpreting curriculum guides	23.5	13.8
	INSTRUCTIONAL		
7.	Developing questioning techniques	17.7	6.9
8.	Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	38.2	37.9
9.	Planning role-playing	14.7	24.1
10.	Developing/using small group activities	50.0	31.0
11.	Planning individualized instruction	58.8	41.4
12.	Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	17.7	17.2
13.	Leading discussions	14.7	10.3
14.	Grouping for instruction	35.3	44.8
	AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15.	Operating audio-visual equipment	67.7	62.1
16.	Using kits, charts, games, simulations	47.1	31.0
17.	Developing own audio-visual materials	29.4	17.2
	SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18.	Diagnosis of learning difficulties	91.2	89.7
19.	Developing remedial programs	85.3	79.3
20.	Obtaining student-background information	58.8	48.3
21.	Solving teacher-pupil problems	64.7	48.3
	N	34 100.0	29 100.0

Instructional task areas. When responses in this section were compared, higher percentages of Division 1 than Division 2 teachers sought assistance in "Developing questioning techniques," "Developing/using small group activities," "Planning individualized instruction," and "Leading discussions." Percentages were similar in "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations" and "Using problem-solving/discovery/inquiry method," while 24 percent of Division 2 teachers and 15 percent of Division 1 teachers desired assistance in "Planning role playing." More Division 2 teachers (45 percent) than Division 1 teachers (35 percent) sought help in "Grouping for instruction."

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. In all areas slightly higher percentages of Division 1 teachers desired assistance, for example, "Operating audio-visual equipment" was indicated by 68 percent of Division 1 teachers and 62 percent of Division 2 teachers.

Special Student Needs task areas. Again, consultative assistance was desired by higher percentages of Division 1 than Division 2 teachers in all areas, although in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Developing remedial programs" the numerical difference was slight.

Responses Classified by Formal Position

Table 8 contains the responses of teachers desiring consultative assistance when classified by formal position. Only in one area, "Developing questioning techniques," was the higher percentage of responses indicated by other position holders.

Table 8

Percentage of Teachers Desiring Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area, by Formal Position in School

TASK AREA No. Description	Formal Position in School Teachers %	 Other Position Holders %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1. Developing course outlines	55.1	54.6
2. Selecting instructional materials	73.9	63.6
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	55.1	0.0
4. Developing instructional materials	50.7	27.3
5. Evaluating lessons/units	31.9	0.0
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	18.8	0.0
INSTRUCTIONAL		
7. Developing questioning techniques	13.0	18.2
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	40.6	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	17.4	0.0
10. Developing/using small group activities	40.6	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	52.2	9.1
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	14.5	9.1
13. Leading discussions	11.6	9.1
14. Grouping for instruction	36.2	27.3
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	68.1	36.4
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	37.7	18.2
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	23.2	18.2
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	87.0	72.7
19. Developing remedial programs	78.3	54.6
20. Obtaining student-background information	55.1	45.5
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	53.6	36.4
N	69 100.0	11 100.0

Curriculum and Program task areas. Approximately the same percentage of teachers and other position holders (55 percent) indicated a desire for assistance in "Developing course outlines." "Selecting instructional materials" was indicated by 74 percent of teachers and 64 percent of other position holders. The only other area in which other position holders had concerns was in "Developing instructional materials," marked by 27 percent of other position holders and 51 percent of teachers.

Instructional task areas. Other position holders expressed no concerns in three of the areas in this section. Eighteen percent of other personnel and 13 percent of teachers desired assistance in "Developing questioning techniques." Thirty-six percent of teachers and 27 percent of other position holders had concerns in "Grouping for instruction."

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. While other personnel had concerns in all areas in this section, the percentage of other position holders desiring assistance was smaller in all three areas. Sixty-eight percent of teachers and 36 percent of other personnel desired assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment." Eighteen percent of other personnel sought assistance in "Using kits, charts, games, simulations" and "Making own audio-visual materials," compared with 38 percent and 23 percent of teachers, respectively.

Special Student Needs task areas. Over 50 percent of teachers desired assistance in all four task areas. A majority of other position holders also expressed concerns in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," and "Developing remedial programs." Forty-six percent sought assistance in "Obtaining student-background information" and 36 percent in "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

SUB-PROBLEM 1.3

Statement. "Which concerns were most frequently indicated by teachers?"

The percentage of concerns in each task area is given in Table 9. The concern most frequently mentioned was "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" (10 percent). Nine percent of all concerns were in the area "Developing remedial programs," and 8 percent in "Selecting instructional materials." Following in descending order of percentages were "Operating audio-visual equipment" (7 percent), "Developing course outlines" (6 percent), "Obtaining student-background information" (6 percent), "Solving teacher-pupil problems" (6 percent), "Developing unit/lesson plans" (6 percent), "Developing instructional materials" (6 percent), and "Planning individualized instruction" (5 percent). The area least frequently mentioned, with one percent of total concerns, was "Leading discussions."

SUB-PROBLEM 1.4

Statement. "Which concerns were most frequently indicated by teachers when examined by:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,

Table 9

Percentage Distribution of Concerns in Each Task Area for All Teachers

TASK AREA No.	Description	Concerns %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1.	Developing course outlines	6.4*
2.	Selecting instructional materials	8.4
3.	Developing unit/lesson plans	5.5
4.	Developing instructional materials	5.5
5.	Evaluating lessons/units	3.2
6.	Interpreting curriculum guides	1.9
INSTRUCTIONAL		
7.	Developing questioning techniques	1.6
8.	Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	4.1
9.	Planning role-playing	1.7
10.	Developing/using small group activities	4.1
11.	Planning individualized instruction	5.4
12.	Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	1.6
13.	Leading discussions	1.3
14.	Grouping for instruction	4.1
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15.	Operating audio-visual equipment	7.4
16.	Using kits, charts, games, simulations	4.1
17.	Developing own audio-visual materials	2.6
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18.	Diagnosis of learning difficulties	9.9
19.	Developing remedial programs	8.9
20.	Obtaining student-background information	6.3
21.	Solving teacher-pupil problems	6.0
	N	687
		100.0

*Of the 689 concerns mentioned by the 80 teachers in the study, 6.4 percent were in task area 1, Developing course outlines.

3. years of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?"

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

The percentage of concerns in each task area when examined by years of post-secondary education is given in Table 10.

The ranking of most frequently mentioned concerns was different for each category. However, two task areas, "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Developing remedial programs," were ranked first and second in all but one instance. For teachers with five and six years of post-secondary education, "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" was mentioned most frequently (11 percent of all concerns in this category) whereas "Developing remedial programs" ranked fifth, with only 7 percent of all concerns. Concerns in "Selecting instructional materials" were ranked second or third in each category. Concerns in "Operating audio-visual equipment" were mentioned most frequently by teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education.

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Table 11 shows the percentage of concerns in each task area distributed according to total years of teaching experience.

While the ranking of concerns within each category differed, certain task areas were most frequently named in all categories. "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" was the most frequently mentioned concern in all categories, rating 19 percent of the concerns of teachers with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience. Other

Table 10

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Years of Post-Secondary Education

TASK AREA		Years of Post-Secondary Education			
No.	Description	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %
	CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM				
1.	Developing course outlines	4.8*	5.4	6.8	7.8
2.	Selecting instructional materials	11.3	7.6	8.0	9.7
3.	Developing unit/lesson plans	6.5	5.4	6.2	2.9
4.	Developing instructional materials	1.6	7.0	5.4	4.9
5.	Evaluating lessons/units	1.6	3.8	3.0	3.9
6.	Interpreting curriculum guides	1.6	1.1	2.4	1.9
	INSTRUCTIONAL				
7.	Developing questioning techniques	1.6	0.5	1.8	2.9
8.	Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	4.8	4.3	3.9	3.9
9.	Planning role-playing	1.6	2.7	1.5	1.0
10.	Developing/using small group activities	3.2	4.9	4.5	1.9
11.	Planning individualized instruction	3.2	7.0	5.3	3.9
12.	Using problem-solving/inquiry/ discovery method	0.0	2.2	1.5	1.9
13.	Leading discussions	0.0	1.6	1.5	1.0
14.	Grouping for instruction	3.2	3.2	4.5	4.9
	AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY				
15.	Operating audio-visual equipment	11.3	6.5	6.8	8.7
16.	Using kits, charts, games, simulations	1.6	4.3	4.5	3.9
17.	Developing own audio-visual materials	1.6	3.2	1.8	4.9
	SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS				
18.	Diagnosis of learning difficulties	14.5	8.1	9.8	10.7
19.	Developing remedial programs	11,3	9.2	8.9	6.8
20.	Obtaining student-background information	6.5	7.0	5.3	7.8
21.	Solving teacher-pupil problems	8.1	4.9	6.5	4.9
	N	62	185	337	103
		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

*Of the 62 concerns expressed by the teachers with 1-2 years of post-secondary education, 4.8 percent were in task area 1, Developing course outlines.

Table 11

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Total Years of Teaching Experience

TASK AREA No. Description	Total Years of Teaching Experience 1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	Over 20 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM					
1. Developing course outlines	6.4	8.0	5.3	5.1	7.4
2. Selecting instructional materials	7.5	8.6	8.9	8.5	14.8
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	6.8	4.9	6.2	3.4	3.7
4. Developing instructional materials	6.8	4.9	4.4	5.1	3.7
5. Evaluating lessons/units	3.4	3.7	2.7	2.5	3.7
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	2.6	1.2	2.7	0.9	0.0
INSTRUCTIONAL					
7. Developing questioning techniques	1.9	2.5	1.8	0.0	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	4.1	4.9	1.8	5.9	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	1.9	2.5	1.8	0.9	0.0
10. Developing/using small group activities	4.1	3.7	5.3	4.2	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	4.1	5.5	7.1	7.6	0.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	0.8	3.1	0.9	1.7	3.7
13. Leading discussions	2.6	0.6	0.9	0.0	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	3.8	4.9	4.4	4.2	0.0
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY					
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	7.9	7.4	6.2	6.8	11.1
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	5.3	4.3	3.5	2.5	0.0
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	3.4	2.5	2.7	0.0	7.4
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS					
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	7.9	8.6	9.7	14.4	18.5
19. Developing remedial programs	7.9	7.4	8.9	13.6	7.4
20. Obtaining student-background information	6.0	6.1	7.1	5.9	7.4
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	4.9	4.9	8.0	6.8	11.1
N	266 100.0	163 100.0	113 100.0	118 100.0	27 100.0

areas which rated highly in all categories were "Development of remedial programs," "Selecting instructional materials," and "Operating audio-visual equipment."

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School

The most frequently mentioned concerns were in the same task areas regardless of classification of responses by years of employment in their present school (Table 12).

These were "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" with 12 percent of all concerns of those employed for three to ten years in their present school and "Developing remedial programs" with approximately 7 percent of concerns in each category. "Selecting instructional materials" and "Operating audio-visual equipment" were mentioned frequently by teachers in all categories. Teachers longest in the school were more concerned with "Planning individualized instruction" than were other teachers, with 7 percent of their concerns in this area compared to 5 percent of the concerns of teachers in their first year of employment in the school.

Responses Classified by Grade Division

Regardless of grade division, all teachers frequently desired assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Developing remedial programs," "Operating audio-visual equipment" and "Selecting instructional materials" (Table 13).

These task areas were ranked as the first four in both grade divisions, although "Selecting instructional materials" was a more frequent concern of Division 2 than Division 1 teachers.

Table 12

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Years of Employment in Present School

TASK AREA	Years of Employment in Present School		
No. Description	1 %	2 %	3-10 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM			
1. Developing course outlines	6.4	6.4	6.4
2. Selecting instructional materials	8.7	7.4	9.1
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	6.0	5.0	5.4
4. Developing instructional materials	6.0	5.9	4.3
5. Evaluating lessons/units	2.7	4.0	3.2
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	2.7	1.5	1.1
INSTRUCTIONAL			
7. Developing questioning techniques	0.7	3.5	1.1
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	4.4	3.5	1.1
9. Planning role-playing	1.0	2.5	2.1
10. Developing/using small group activities	4.7	3.5	3.7
11. Planning individualized instruction	4.7	5.0	7.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	1.3	1.5	2.1
13. Leading discussions	1.0	3.0	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	4.4	4.0	3.7
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY			
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	8.1	6.9	7.0
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	4.4	5.5	2.1
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	3.0	1.0	3.7
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS			
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	8.7	9.4	12.3
19. Developing remedial programs	8.1	9.4	9.6
20. Obtaining student-background information	7.1	5.0	6.4
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	6.0	6.4	5.4
N	298 100.0	202 100.0	187 100.0

Table 13

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Grade Division

TASK AREA No. Description	Grade Division 1 (Gr.1-3) %	 2 (Gr.4-6) %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1. Developing course outlines	5.6	6.4
2. Selecting instructional materials	7.1	10.0
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	6.5	5.2
4. Developing instructional materials	5.3	5.6
5. Evaluating lessons/units	3.5	2.8
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	2.4	1.6
INSTRUCTIONAL		
7. Developing questioning techniques	1.8	0.8
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	3.8	4.4
9. Planning role-playing	1.5	2.8
10. Developing/using small group activities	5.0	3.6
11. Planning individualized instruction	5.9	4.8
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	1.8	2.0
13. Leading discussions	1.5	1.2
14. Grouping for instruction	3.5	5.2
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	6.8	7.2
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	4.7	3.6
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	3.0	2.0
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	9.1	10.4
19. Developing remedial programs	8.9	9.2
20. Obtaining student-background information	5.9	5.6
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	6.5	5.6
N	339 100.0	250 100.0

SUB-PROBLEM 1.5

Statement. "What percentage of the concerns mentioned in each task area were recurring?"

As can be seen from Table 14, the majority of concerns in all areas except "Interpreting curriculum guides" were recurring concerns. Over 80 percent of concerns were recurring in the following task areas: "Developing unit/lesson plans" (87 percent), "Developing instructional materials" (92 percent), "Evaluating lessons/units" (91 percent), "Developing questioning techniques" (91 percent), "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations" (89 percent), "Developing/using small group activities" (86 percent), "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method" (82 percent), "Making own audio-visual materials" (89 percent), "Developing remedial programs" (89 percent), and "Solving teacher-pupil problems" (86 percent).

SUB-PROBLEM 1.6

Statement. "Did teachers who indicated all their concerns as recurring differ significantly from their colleagues in:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school,
4. grade division, and
5. formal position in school?"

The twenty-six teachers who had indicated all their concerns as recurring were compared with the remainder of the population who

Table 14

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, by Time of Year

TASK AREA No. Description	Time of Year Non-Recurring Concerns Sept.-Oct. %	 Nov.-Dec. %	 Jan.-Feb. %	Recurring Concerns %	 N
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM					
1. Developing course outlines	47.8	0.0	0.0	52.3	44*
2. Selecting instructional materials	31.0	0.0	0.0	69.0	58
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	13.1	0.0	0.0	86.8	38
4. Developing instructional materials	7.9	0.0	0.0	92.1	38
5. Evaluating lessons/units	9.1	0.0	0.0	90.9	22
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	69.2	0.0	0.0	30.8	13
INSTRUCTIONAL					
7. Developing questioning techniques	9.1	0.0	0.0	90.9	11
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	10.7	0.0	0.0	89.3	28
9. Planning role-playing	16.7	8.3	8.3	66.7	12
10. Developing/using small group activities	10.7	0.0	3.6	85.7	28
11. Planning individualized instruction	18.9	0.0	2.7	78.4	37
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	0.0	9.1	9.1	81.8	11
13. Leading discussions	11.1	0.0	22.2	66.7	9
14. Grouping for instruction	42.9	0.0	3.6	53.8	28
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY					
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	21.6	2.0	5.9	70.6	51
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	21.4	10.7	3.6	64.3	28
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	5.6	0.0	5.6	88.9	18
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS					
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	19.1	0.0	1.5	79.4	68
19. Developing remedial programs	11.5	0.0	0.0	88.5	60
20. Obtaining student-background information	27.9	2.3	0.0	69.8	43
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	9.8	2.4	2.4	85.5	41

*Each N = 100.0

had both recurring and once-only concerns. This combination of concerns was termed mixed concerns. The twenty-six teachers were found to differ significantly from their colleagues in their total years of teaching experience, and grade division. Tables 15 and 16 give the distribution of responses by these two background variables.

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience

In general, the percentage of teachers who had all recurring concerns increased with total years of teaching experience, while over 68 percent of teachers with mixed concerns had less than six years of teaching experience. These differences were statistically significant at the .004 level of confidence.

Responses Classified by Grade Division

While the preponderance of teachers with all recurring concerns were in Division 2, only 33 percent of Division 1 teachers were represented. Over 62 percent of teachers with mixed concerns were in Division 1 and 38 percent were in Division 2. These findings were statistically significant at the .02 level of confidence.

SUB-PROBLEM 1.7

Statement. "What percentage of concerns mentioned in each task area occurred at the September-October period during the beginning of the year?"

The percentage of concerns in each task area by time of year is shown in Table 14 (p. 77). These concerns which occurred once during the school year fell almost entirely into the September-October period.

Table 15

Distribution of Teachers by Type of Concerns, by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Total Years of Teaching Experience	All Recurring Concerns %	Mixed Concerns %
1- 3 years	7.7	42.6
4- 6 years	15.4	25.9
7-11 years	23.1	9.3
11-20 years	38.5	16.7
Over 20 years	15.4	5.6
	26 100.0	54 100.0

Chi square = 15.6, p=.004

Table 16

Distribution of Teachers by Type of Concerns, by Grade Division

Grade Division	All Recurring Concerns %	Mixed Concerns %
Division 1 (Gr. 1-3)	33.3	62.2
Division 2 (Gr. 4-6)	66.7	37.8
N	18 100.0	45 100.0

Chi square = 4.3, p=.02

The area with the most non-recurring concerns was "Interpreting curriculum guides." Sixty-nine percent of all concerns in this area were during the September-October period. Other concerns which predominated at this time were "Developing course outlines," 48 percent of all concerns in the area, "Grouping for instruction" (43 percent), and "Selecting instructional materials" (31 percent). "Obtaining student-background information" was also important during September-October as was "Operating audio-visual equipment" and "Using kits, charts, games, simulations." Nineteen percent of all concerns in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" also occurred at the beginning of the school year.

SUB-PROBLEM 1.8

Statement. "To what extent were differences in the percentage of concerns which occurred during September-October in each task area associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. years of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?"

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

Table 17 shows the percentage of concerns in each task area in September-October distributed by years of post-secondary education. "Selecting instructional materials" was chosen most frequently by teachers with three or less years of post-secondary education while

Table 17

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Years of Post-Secondary Education

TASK AREA No. Description	Years of Post-Secondary Education 1-2 %	 3 %	 4 %	 5-6 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM				
1. Developing course outlines	15.0	11.4	15.1	23.1
2. Selecting instructional materials	25.0	17.2	8.2	7.7
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	0.0	5.7	2.7	7.7
4. Developing instructional materials	0.0	2.9	2.7	0.0
5. Evaluating lessons/units	0.0	0.0	1.4	7.7
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	5.0	2.9	8.2	7.7
INSTRUCTIONAL				
7. Developing questioning techniques	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	0.0	5.7	1.4	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	0.0	0.0	1.4	7.7
10. Developing/using small group activities	0.0	2.9	2.7	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	0.0	11.4	4.1	0.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/ discovery method	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Leading discussions	0.0	0.0	1.4	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	10.0	8.6	8.2	7.7
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY				
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	15.0	2.9	6.9	15.4
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	5.0	2.9	4.1	7.7
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	0.0	2.9	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS				
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	10.0	8.6	9.6	7.7
19. Developing remedial programs	5.0	5.7	5.5	0.0
20. Obtaining student-background information	10.0	8.6	9.6	0.0
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	0.0	0.0	5.5	0.0
N	20	35	73	13
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

"Developing course outlines" was the most frequently mentioned concern for teachers with four or more years of post-secondary education. However, teachers with one to three years of training indicated "Developing course outlines" often enough for it to rank second.

Three task areas, "Grouping for instruction," "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," and "Obtaining student-background information," were of common concern to all teachers except those with five to six years of post-secondary education who had no concerns in "Obtaining student-background information" at the beginning of the school year. "Planning individualized instruction" was frequently mentioned by teachers with three years of post-secondary education.

Responses Classified by Total Years of Teaching Experience

There was no difference in the ranking of most frequent concerns of teachers with one to three years and teachers with four to six years of teaching experience, (Table 18).

As length of teaching experience increased, there was a general decrease in the number of areas in which assistance was desired at the beginning of the school year. The most frequently mentioned concern for teachers in all categories was "Developing course outlines." "Selecting instructional materials," "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," and "Operating audio-visual equipment" were mentioned frequently by all teachers except those with over twenty years of teaching experience.

Seven percent of all the reported concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience, and 15 percent of those of teachers with four to six years of experience were in "Grouping for

Table 18

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Total Years of Teaching Experience

TASK AREA No. Description	Total Years of Teaching Experience 1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	Over 20 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM					
1. Developing course outlines	12.3	26.9	6.7	13.0	25.0
2. Selecting instructional materials	11.0	15.4	20.0	13.0	0.0
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	5.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
4. Developing instructional materials	1.4	0.0	0.0	8.7	0.0
5. Evaluating lessons/units	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	8.2	0.0	13.3	4.4	0.0
INSTRUCTIONAL					
7. Developing questioning techniques	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	2.7	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	1.4	3.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
10. Developing/using small group activities	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	5.5	0.0	6.7	8.7	0.0
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Leading discussions	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	6.9	15.4	0.0	13.0	0.0
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY					
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	8.2	7.7	13.3	0.0	25.0
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	5.5	3.9	6.7	0.0	0.0
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS					
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	9.6	7.7	6.7	13.0	0.0
19. Developing remedial programs	4.1	3.9	6.7	8.7	0.0
20. Obtaining student-background information	5.5	7.7	20.0	13.0	0.0
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	2.7	3.9	0.0	4.4	0.0
N	73 100.0	26 100.0	15 100.0	23 100.0	4 100.0

instruction," an area also important to teachers in the eleven to twenty years category.

For teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience, 13 percent of their concerns were in "Interpreting curriculum guides," compared to 8 percent of the concerns of those in the one to three years category, and 4 percent of those teachers with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience.

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in School

The percentage of concerns in each task area for the September-October period, classified by years of employment in the school is given in Table 19. Approximately 14 percent of teacher concerns in each category regardless of years of employment in school, were in "Developing course outlines." Yet, while 17 percent of the concerns of teachers new to the school and 15 percent of the concerns of those with three to ten years of employment were in "Selecting instructional materials," only 5 percent of the concerns of teachers with two years of employment were in this area.

Almost 11 percent of the concerns of teachers new to the school were in "Operating audio-visual equipment." The percentage of all concerns in this area decreased as years of employment in the school increased.

In comparison, the percentage of concerns in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" rose as years of employment in the school increased, with 12 percent of the concerns of teachers with three to ten years of employment being in this area. This was also the

Table 19

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Years of Employment in School

TASK AREA No. Description	Years of Employment in School 1 %	 2 %	 3-10 %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM			
1. Developing course outlines	13.9	14.0	18.2
2. Selecting instructional materials	16.9	4.7	15.2
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	4.6	2.3	3.0
4. Developing instructional materials	0.0	4.7	3.0
5. Evaluating lessons/units	0.0	2.3	3.0
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	7.7	7.0	3.0
INSTRUCTIONAL			
7. Developing questioning techniques	0.0	2.3	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	1.5	2.3	3.0
9. Planning role-playing	1.5	2.3	0.0
10. Developing/using small group activities	1.5	4.7	0.0
11. Planning individualized instruction	1.5	7.0	9.1
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	0.0	0.0	0.0
13. Leading discussions	0.0	2.3	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	6.2	7.0	15.2
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY			
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	10.8	7.0	3.0
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	6.2	4.7	0.0
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	1.5	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS			
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	9.2	7.0	12.1
19. Developing remedial programs	4.6	7.0	3.0
20. Obtaining student-background information	9.2	7.0	9.1
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	3.1	4.7	0.0
N	65 100.0	43 100.0	33 100.0

case in other areas. In "Planning individualized instruction" the percentage of concerns rose from 2 percent for teachers new to the school to 9 percent for those teachers with three to ten years of employment in the school, and in "Grouping for instruction" the percentage of concerns were 6.7 and 15 percent respectively.

Responses Classified by Grade Division

When the percentage of concerns in each task area was examined by grade division (Table 20), the concerns more often mentioned by Division 2 teachers were different from those for Division 1 teachers.

While Division 1 teachers had concerns in almost all areas, Division 2 teachers were more specific in their selection of concerns. Division 2 teachers had higher percentages of concerns in areas related to curriculum and program planning. Over 21 percent of their concerns were in "Developing course outlines" and 24 percent in "Selecting instructional materials."

Division 2 teachers more frequently mentioned concerns in "Planning individualized instruction" and "Grouping for instruction" while Division 1 teachers had greater percentages of concerns in "Interpreting curriculum guides," and all the task areas in the Special Student Needs section.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented teachers' responses to Problem 1, namely: in which task areas and at what period of the school year did teachers desire consultative assistance?

Table 20

Percentage of Concerns in Each Task Area, in September-October, by Grade Division

TASK AREA No. Description	Grade Division 1 (Gr.1-3) %	 2 (Gr.4-6) %
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1. Developing course outlines	11.0	21.4
2. Selecting instructional materials	7.3	23.8
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	4.9	2.4
4. Developing instructional materials	2.4	0.0
5. Evaluating lessons/units	2.4	0.0
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	8.5	2.4
INSTRUCTIONAL		
7. Developing questioning techniques	1.2	0.0
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	3.7	0.0
9. Planning role-playing	1.2	2.4
10. Developing/using small group activities	2.4	2.4
11. Planning individualized instruction	3.7	7.1
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	0.0	0.0
13. Leading discussions	1.2	0.0
14. Grouping for instruction	6.1	14.3
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	7.3	7.1
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	3.7	4.8
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	1.2	0.0
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	9.8	7.1
19. Developing remedial programs	6.1	2.4
20. Obtaining student-background information	11.0	2.4
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	4.9	0.0
N	82 100.0	42 100.0

The highest percentages of teachers desiring consultative assistance were in the Special Student Needs task areas, with 85 percent of teachers indicating a desire for assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," and 75 percent seeking assistance in "Development of remedial programs." The selection of instructional materials was also an important concern for 73 percent of teachers.

Teachers with less than three years of teaching experience and those with more than four years of post-secondary education had a wider variety and a higher percentage of concerns than had other teachers. While the percentage of teachers desiring assistance decreased as years of employment in the system increased, there was no discernible trend when responses were classified by years in their present school. The concerns of Division 1 teachers differed from those of Division 2 teachers with higher percentages of Division 1 teachers desiring assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans," "Evaluating lessons/units," "Developing questioning techniques," "Developing/using small group activities," "Planning individualized instruction," and in all areas in Audio-Visual Technology and Special Student Needs task areas. In general, more teachers than other position holders had concerns in all areas.

The concerns mentioned most frequently by teachers were "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Developing remedial programs," and "Selecting instructional materials," and this ranking was maintained regardless of classification by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in their present school, and by grade division.

The majority of concerns in all areas except the "Interpretation of curriculum guides" were recurring. In ten areas, over 80 percent of the concerns were recurring: "Developing unit/lesson plans," "Developing instructional materials," "Evaluating lessons/units," "Developing questioning techniques," "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," "Developing/using small group activities," "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method," "Making own audio-visual materials," "Developing remedial programs," and "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

The teachers who indicated all their concerns as recurring were more frequently in Division 2 and had been teaching for more than six years.

The concerns which were most predominant at the beginning of the year were "Interpreting curriculum guides," "Developing course outlines," "Grouping for instruction," and "Selecting instructional materials." "Developing course outlines" and "Selecting instructional materials" were the most frequently mentioned areas in all categories when responses were examined by years of post-secondary education. In general, Division 2 teachers and those with at least six years of teaching experience were more selective in their concerns at the beginning of the school year. In some areas the percentage of concerns decreased as years of employment decreased while the percentage rose in other areas. Concerns with "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Grouping for instruction," and "Planning individualized instruction" were more evident for teachers who had taught in the school for at least three years.

Chapter 6

SPECIFIC CONCERNS OF TEACHERS

The analyses of the data for Problem 2 are discussed in this chapter. The specific concerns of teachers within each task area are described and these concerns are examined according to selected teacher characteristics.

SUB-PROBLEM 2.1

Statement. "Within each task area, what were teachers' specific concerns?"

The distribution of specific concerns reported by teachers is given in Table 21. There was a substantial similarity in the specific concerns mentioned by teachers so that, in some task areas, they reported only one specific concern.

Curriculum and Program task areas. Many of the concerns in this section stemmed from a desire to discuss and exchange ideas. Arranging for the cooperative planning and making of materials was also important. However, 63 percent of the concerns in "Developing course outlines" and 18 percent of those in "Selecting instructional materials" were related to finding out which concepts were essential in their grade level and how to select materials to teach these concepts. These concerns were mentioned again in "Interpreting curriculum guides," where discussion of the appropriate specific skills required was desired.

Table 21

Distribution of Specific Concerns in Each Task Area

Specific Concerns		f	%
TASK AREA 1 - Developing course outlines			
Discuss, share, cooperate in specific subject areas		21	37.5
What is expected in grade level		35	62.5
	N	56	100.0
TASK AREA 2 - Selecting instructional materials			
What materials available generally/ What new materials available/ Rating of materials		26	24.5
What materials available in school/ Obtaining materials available in school		44	41.5
Selecting materials to teach concepts		19	17.9
Ordering materials/Obtaining catalogues/ Financial concerns re ordering		17	16.0
	N	106	100.0
TASK AREA 3 - Developing unit/lesson plans			
Obtaining, exchanging ideas generally/for new units		34	55.7
Exchanging materials		18	29.5
Cooperative planning		9	14.8
	N	61	100.0
TASK AREA 4 - Developing instructional materials			
Planning/Obtaining ideas re materials and teaching techniques		26	53.1
Making/Obtaining materials/Comparing notes/ Dittoing copies		23	46.9
	N	49	100.0
TASK AREA 5 - Evaluating lessons/units			
Looking over plans/Evaluation of instructional materials		17	54.8
Post-evaluation of students/of unit.		14	45.2
	N	31	100.0
TASK AREA 6 - Interpreting curriculum guides			
Linking guide to teaching/Discussion of specific skills required at grade level or in specific subject areas	N	13	100.0
TASK AREA 7 - Developing questioning techniques			
How/what to ask	N	11	100.0

Table 21 (continued)

Specific Concerns		f	%
TASK AREA 8 - Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations			
Unsure of basic concepts/Would like feedback in specific subject areas		17	32.1
Information on ways to handle problems		18	34.0
Would like to know new ideas and techniques which work		18	34.0
	N	53	100.0
TASK AREA 9 - Planning role-playing			
How to do it/Where to use it/for specific subject areas	N	12	100.0
TASK AREA 10 - Developing/using small group activities			
Exchanging activity centre ideas		16	34.8
Exchanging small group work ideas		19	41.3
How to get group to work together/ Exchanging ideas on when and what works well		11	23.9
	N	46	100.0
TASK AREA 11 - Planning individualized instruction			
Obtaining more information in specific subject areas re how it works and related materials		20	48.8
Diagnosis of student level or student problem/ Working with other teachers re student progress		21	51.2
	N	41	100.0
TASK AREA 12 - Using problem-solving/inquiry/ discovery method			
How to use/Associated problems/How to introduce	N	11	100.0
TASK AREA 13 - Leading discussions			
How to introduce/How to encourage students/ Coordination with other staff	N	9	100.0
TASK AREA 14 - Grouping for instruction			
Dividing class at the beginning of year		15	26.8
Grouping for different skills		20	35.7
Information on level of students/Whom to group together/Use of group leaders		21	37.5
	N	56	100.0

Table 21 (continued)

Specific Concerns		f	%
TASK AREA 15 - Operating audio-visual equipment			
Operation/Availability		41	68.3
Maintenance		19	31.7
	N	60	100.0
TASK AREA 16 - Using kits, charts, games, simulations			
What kits to use/How to use		21	50.0
Information on what materials available/What new materials available		21	50.0
	N	42	100.0
TASK AREA 17 - Developing own audio-visual materials			
Making specific materials		10	45.5
Getting ideas/Gearing to level of students/ Knowing what is available/Getting enough time		12	54.5
	N	22	100.0
TASK AREA 18 - Diagnosis of learning difficulties			
Diagnosis for specific pupils	N	68	100.0
TASK AREA 19 - Developing remedial programs			
What to do to aid pupils/What materials to use	N	61	100.0
TASK AREA 20 - Obtaining student-background information			
Information from other teachers re academic progress or from school records		13	24.5
Non-cumulative record card information (family background information)		40	75.5
	N	53	100.0
TASK AREA 21 - Solving teacher-pupil problems			
Problem with particular student	N	41	100.0

Instructional task areas. Concerns in this section focused almost entirely on a desire for an explanation of the specific instructional technique. However, in "Developing/using small group activities" teachers were also interested in exchanging ideas about materials to use, and in "Planning individualized instruction" 51 percent wanted to know how to determine the level of the student and to identify student problems. This latter concern was also evident in "Grouping for instruction" where 38 percent sought assistance in identifying the levels of the students and deciding how to group them together. Twenty-seven percent of the concerns in this task area were in dividing the class at the beginning of the year.

In "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations" 32 percent of concerns surfaced because of uncertainty of basic concepts and how to teach them. Another 34 percent were related to handling the instructional problems in this area.

Audio-Visual Technology task areas. Concerns in these task areas revolved around operation of equipment, how to use kits, charts, games, simulations, and how to make audio-visual materials.

Special Student Needs task areas. All the concerns in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" were for assistance in determining difficulties in specific pupils, and those in "Developing remedial programs" were related to what techniques and materials to use to help the student.

Concerns in "Obtaining student-background information" were related to the academic progress of the student or to his home environment. Problems with particular students were usually related to learning difficulties rather than to discipline.

SUB-PROBLEM 2.2

Statement. "To what extent were differences in the distribution of specific concerns in each task area associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. length of employment in their present school, and
4. grade division?"

Tables 22 to 34 contain the distribution of specific concerns by task area and by four background variables, years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, length of employment in the school and grade division. Only those task areas where more than one specific concern was mentioned are included.

Developing Course Outlines

Table 22 contains the distribution of responses for task area 1, "Developing course outlines," when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Specific concerns about concepts and subject matter were more often voiced by teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education, while a desire to discuss and share ideas was a more predominant concern of teachers with three or more years of post-secondary

Table 22

Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 1 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 1 - Developing course outlines

Specific Concerns

1. Discuss, share, cooperate in specific subject areas
2. What is expected in grade level

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	25.0*	40.0	37.0	40.0	30.0	33.3	45.5	37.5	100.0
2.	75.0	60.0	63.0	60.0	70.0	66.7	54.5	62.5	0.0
N	4	15	27	10	20	15	11	8	2

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	29.2	44.4	42.9	39.3	21.1
2.	70.8	55.6	57.1	60.7	78.9
N	24	18	14	15	32

*25 percent of the total concerns (4) of teachers with 1-2 years of Post-Secondary Education about "Developing course outlines," were in discussing, sharing, and cooperating in specific subject areas.

education. In general, approximately 40 percent of concerns dealt with the exchange of ideas and 60 percent with essential concepts and subject matter.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. While the concerns of teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience were almost evenly divided between discussing ideas and obtaining clarification of grade level concepts, teachers in other categories had a different balance of concerns. Apart from teachers who were in the over twenty years category, teachers with either fewer than six years or more than ten years of teaching experience had twice as many concerns about concepts and subject matter than they had about sharing ideas.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. While 70 percent of the concerns of teachers new to the school were about what concepts were essential to their grade level, this percentage fell to 56 percent for teachers in their second year. Approximately 44 percent of the concerns of teachers who had been teaching in the school for at least a year were in exchanging and sharing ideas, while only 29 percent of the concerns of teachers new to the school fell in this category.

Responses classified by grade division. A higher percentage of Division 2 teachers (79 percent) than Division 1 teachers (61 percent) was interested in obtaining knowledge of subject matter, essential concepts and what is expected at the grade level. Correspondingly, Division 1 teachers were more concerned about discussing ideas and cooperating in developing course outlines than were Division 2 teachers.

Selecting Instructional Materials

Table 23 contains the distribution of responses for task area 2, "Selecting instructional materials," when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Twenty-six percent of the concerns of teachers with three years of post-secondary education were in selecting materials to teach specific concepts. Only 11 percent of the concerns of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education were in this category. Ordering materials was more often a concern of teachers with three or more years of post-secondary education, while knowing what materials were available in the school was most often mentioned by teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. The concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience were more similar to those of teachers with seven to ten years than to those of teachers with four to six years of teaching experience. Fourteen percent of the concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience and 13 percent of the concerns of teachers in the seven to ten years category were in selecting materials to teach specific concepts while 27 percent of the concerns of teachers with four to six years of teaching experience were in this area. Fifty percent of the concerns of teachers with one to

Table 23

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 2 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 2 - Selecting instructional materials

Specific Concerns

1. What materials available generally/What new materials available/Rating of materials
2. What materials available in school/Obtaining materials available
3. Selecting materials to teach concepts
4. Ordering materials/Obtaining catalogues/Financial concerns re ordering

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2	3	4	5-6	1-3	4-6	7-10	11-20	20+
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1.	25.0	14.8	26.5	33.3	16.2	26.9	12.5	36.4	60.0
2.	50.0	44.4	38.8	38.9	51.4	34.6	50.0	27.3	40.0
3.	16.7	25.9	16.3	11.1	13.5	26.9	12.5	22.7	0.0
4.	8.3	14.8	18.4	16.7	18.9	11.5	25.0	13.6	0.0
N	12	27	49	18	37	26	16	22	5

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1	2	3-10	1	2
	%	%	%	%	%
1.	13.3	28.6	36.4	20.0	26.8
2.	48.9	35.7	36.4	44.4	41.5
3.	22.2	21.4	9.1	22.2	14.6
4.	15.6	14.3	18.2	13.3	17.1
N	45	28	33	45	41

three and seven to ten years of teaching experience were related to what materials were available in the school.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Of teachers who indicated a desire for consultative assistance in "Selecting instructional materials," those who were new to the school were more interested in what materials were available, and in selecting materials to teach concepts than were teachers who had been teaching there for longer periods. The latter were more concerned with what new materials had been published and what materials were available from the central office than were teachers in their first year in the school.

Responses classified by grade division. There was little difference in distribution of concerns when examined by grade division. Twenty-two percent of the concerns of Division 1 teachers and 15 percent of the concerns of Division 2 teachers were in selecting materials to teach concepts.

Developing Unit/Lesson Plans

The distribution of responses for task area 3, "Developing unit/lesson plans," when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division, is shown in Table 24.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Of those teachers who desired assistance in "Developing unit/lesson plans," teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education were more interested in cooperative planning than were other teachers.

Table 24

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 3 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 3 - Developing unit/lesson plans

Specific Concerns

1. Obtaining, exchanging ideas generally/for new units
2. Exchanging materials
3. Cooperative planning

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	57.1	56.3	57.6	40.0	53.1	63.6	50.0	80.0	0.0
2.	28.6	31.3	30.3	20.0	37.5	18.2	33.3	0.0	0.0
3.	14.3	12.5	12.1	40.0	9.4	18.2	16.7	20.0	100.0
N	7	16	33	5	32	11	12	5	1

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	47.1	56.3	81.8	54.3	54.6
2.	38.2	25.0	9.1	28.6	31.8
3.	14.7	18.8	9.1	17.1	13.6
N	34	16	11	35	22

Forty percent of the concerns of teachers in the five to six years category were in this area compared to an average of 13 percent for teachers with fewer years of post-secondary education. Teachers with four or less years of post-secondary education had most concerns about exchanging ideas and materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. More experienced teachers expressed a greater desire to plan cooperatively than did teachers with one to three years of teaching experience, while the latter were more concerned about exchanging materials. This was not a concern for teachers with more than ten years of teaching experience.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. The percentage of concerns about exchanging ideas rose from 47 percent of the concerns of new teachers to 82 percent for those who had been teaching in the school for at least three years. In comparison, the exchange of materials was a diminishing concern for teachers as years of employment in the school increased. A desire to plan cooperatively was more often expressed by teachers in their first or second year of employment in the school than by teachers who had been teaching in the school for a longer period.

Responses classified by grade division. There was little difference in concerns when examined by grade division. Teachers in Division 2 had a slightly higher percentage of their concerns about exchanging materials while more of the concerns of Division 1 teachers were about cooperative planning.

Developing Instructional Materials

Table 25 contains the distribution of specific concerns in this task area when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Of teachers who desired assistance in "Developing instructional materials," teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education were solely concerned with making and obtaining materials, while 67 percent of the concerns of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education were in planning units and obtaining ideas and 33 percent of their concerns were with the mechanics of obtaining materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. When the responses of teachers who desired assistance in "Developing instructional materials," were examined, teachers with more than six years of teaching experience were more interested in making materials than in planning units and obtaining ideas. Sixty-one percent of the concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience were in the search for ideas while only 38 percent of the concerns of teachers with eleven to twenty years of experience were in this area.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. The majority of the concerns of new teachers and those in the three to ten years category were in planning units and obtaining ideas, while

Table 25

Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 4 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 4 - Developing instructional materials

Specific Concerns

1. Planning/Obtaining ideas re materials and teaching techniques
2. Making/Obtaining materials/Comparing notes/Dittoing copies

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	0.0	56.3	50.0	66.7	60.9	54.6	33.3	37.5	100.0
2.	100.0	43.8	50.0	33.3	39.1	45.5	66.7	62.5	0.0
N	1	16	26	6	23	11	6	8	1

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	56.5	43.8	60.0	45.8	61.1
2.	43.5	56.3	40.0	54.2	38.9
N	23	16	10	24	18

over 56 percent of the concerns of teachers in their second year of employment in the school were in making materials.

Responses classified by grade division. Teachers in Division 1 were fairly evenly divided in their concerns about developing instructional materials but Division 2 teachers (61 percent) were more concerned with planning units and obtaining ideas than in making materials (39 percent).

Evaluating Lessons/Units

Table 26 contains the distribution of specific concerns in this task area by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Teachers in all categories, except those with five to six years of post-secondary education, were equally concerned about evaluating plans and materials and post-evaluation of units. Sixty percent of the concerns of teachers with most years of post-secondary education were in the evaluation of the instructional plans and materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. Of teachers who desired assistance in "Evaluating lesson/units," teachers with one to three years of teaching experience had approximately equal concerns in both areas, teachers in the four to six years and seven to ten years categories were more interested in evaluation of plans and materials, (63 and 75 percent respectively)

Table 26

Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 5 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 5 - Evaluating lessons/units

Specific Concerns

1. Evaluation of instructional materials and plans
2. Post-evaluation of unit/Post-test evaluation of students

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	50.0	50.0	56.3	60.0	46.2	62.5	75.0	40.0	100.0
2.	50.0	50.0	43.8	40.0	53.9	37.5	25.0	60.0	0.0
N	2	8	16	5	13	8	4	5	1

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	66.7	50.0	42.9	60.0	45.5
2.	33.3	50.0	57.1	40.0	54.6
N	12	12	7	15	11

while 60 percent of the concerns of teachers with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience were in post-evaluation of students and units.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Teachers in their first year in the school were more concerned with evaluation of lesson plans and instructional materials (67 percent), than teachers who had been teaching in the school for at least three years (43 percent). Alternatively, those with most years of employment in the school more often desired assistance in post-evaluation of units than did first year teachers.

Responses classified by grade division. While Division 2 teachers were fairly equally concerned with evaluation of instructional materials and post-evaluation of units and students, Division 1 teachers were more concerned about evaluation of plans and instructional materials. Sixty percent of the concerns of Division 1 teachers were in this area while 55 percent of the concerns of Division 2 teachers were in post-evaluation of units and students.

Teaching Concepts, Constructs, Generalizations

The distribution of responses for task area 8 when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division is shown on Table 27.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. When the responses of those teachers who indicated a desire for consultative assistance in "Teaching concepts, constructs,

Table 27

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 8 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 8 - Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations

Specific Concerns

1. Unsure of basic concepts/Would like feedback in specific subject areas
2. Information on ways to handle problems
3. Would like to know new ideas and techniques which work

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	60.0	33.3	25.9	33.3	25.0	40.0	25.0	40.0	0.0
2.	20.0	33.3	37.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	50.0	30.0	0.0
3.	20.0	33.3	37.0	33.3	41.7	26.7	25.0	30.0	0.0
N	5	12	27	9	24	15	4	10	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	23.1	35.7	46.2	37.5	31.8
2.	38.5	35.7	23.1	33.3	31.8
3.	38.5	28.6	30.8	29.2	36.7
N	26	14	13	24	22

generalizations," were examined, teachers had similar percentages of concerns in all three areas, except in the case of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education. Sixty percent of their concerns were with a desire for feedback and assistance in developing and teaching basic concepts. Teachers with four years of post-secondary education had least concerns in this area and were more interested in obtaining information about how to handle problems (37 percent of concerns) and knowing about new ideas and techniques (37 percent of concerns).

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. Forty percent of the concerns of teachers with four to six years of teaching experience and of teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience were with assistance in teaching basic concepts, while only 25 percent of teachers with least experience and of those in the seven to ten years category desired assistance in this area. Fifty percent of the concerns of teachers in the latter category were in solving a particular problem, while 42 percent of the concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience were with obtaining information about new ideas and techniques.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Teachers with three to ten years of employment in the school were more often concerned with assistance in teaching basic concepts than with information on ways to handle problems, while the reverse was true for teachers new to the school. More new teachers (39 percent of concerns) desired information on new ideas and techniques than did teachers who had been teaching in the school for at least two years (approximately 30 percent of concerns).

Responses classified by grade division. While Division 1 teachers were most concerned about their need for feedback and lack of knowledge about teaching basic concepts, teachers in Division 2 were most interested in knowing what new ideas and techniques were available. Approximately 32 percent of teachers in both grade divisions had concerns about handling problems in teaching concepts.

Developing/Using Small Group Activities

Table 28 contains the distribution of responses for task area 10, "Developing/using small group activities," when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Fifty percent of the concerns of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education and of teachers with four years of training were in exchanging ideas about small group work, while of teachers with three years of post-secondary education and those with five to six years of training 50 percent of concerns were in exchanging activity centre ideas.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. The highest percentages of concerns of teachers in all categories except that of four to six years of teaching experience were in exchanging ideas about small group work. Teachers with four to six years of teaching experience were most concerned with activity centre ideas.

Table 28

Distribution of Specific Concerns in Task Area 10 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 10 - Developing/using small group activities

Specific Concerns

1. Exchanging activity centre ideas
2. Exchanging small group work ideas
3. How to get group to work together/Exchanging ideas on when and what works well

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	25.0	50.0	25.0	50.0	27.8	57.1	33.3	33.3	0.0
2.	50.0	28.6	50.0	25.0	50.0	14.3	41.7	44.4	0.0
3.	25.0	21.4	25.0	25.0	22.2	28.6	25.0	22.2	0.0
N	4	14	24	4	18	7	12	9	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	36.0	16.7	55.6	32.1	38.5
2.	44.0	41.7	33.3	42.9	38.5
3.	20.0	41.7	11.1	25.0	23.1
N	25	12	9	28	13

Teachers in all categories were approximately equally interested in exchanging ideas on group motivation and teaching techniques.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Teachers new to the school were concerned with obtaining ideas for small group work (44 percent of their concerns) and for activity centres (36 percent). Forty-two percent of the concerns of teachers in their second year of teaching in the school were in exchanging ideas for small group work and another 42 percent were in exchanging ideas about group motivation and teaching techniques. In comparison, 56 percent of the concerns of teachers who had been in the school for a longer time were in obtaining ideas for activity centres.

Responses classified by grade division. Teachers in Division 2 were slightly (39 percent to 32 percent) more interested in obtaining activity centre ideas than were Division 1 teachers, while Division 1 teachers had more concerns about small group work. Teachers in both divisions were equally interested in finding out how to get groups to work together and in what materials and subject matter worked best.

Planning Individualized Instruction

The distribution of specific concerns in this task area when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division is shown in Table 29.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Over 60 percent of the concerns of teachers with one to two years

Table 29

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 11 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 11 - Planning individualized instruction

Specific Concerns

1. Obtaining more information in specific subject areas re how it works and related materials
2. Diagnosis of student level or student problem/Working with other teachers re student progress

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	33.3	53.3	38.9	80.0	66.7	55.6	40.0	30.0	0.0
2.	66.7	46.7	61.1	20.0	33.3	44.4	60.0	70.0	0.0
N	3	15	18	5	12	9	10	10	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	56.3	41.7	46.2	45.5	53.9
2.	43.8	58.3	53.9	54.5	46.2
N	16	12	13	22	13

of post-secondary education and those with four years of post-secondary education concerned diagnosing the level of students and obtaining information on recognizing student problems. In contrast, 53 percent of the concerns of teachers with three years of post-secondary education and 80 percent of those with five to six years of post-secondary education were about obtaining more information on the mechanics necessary for individualizing instruction and on suitable materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. The majority of concerns of teachers with one to three and four to six years of teaching experience were in how to individualize instruction while teachers with more than six years of teaching experience were more interested in diagnostic assistance.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Of those teachers who desired assistance in "Planning individualized instruction," teachers new to the school were more interested in how to organize for individualized instruction than were other teachers while teachers who had been teaching in the school for at least two years had the majority of their concerns in the diagnosis of students.

Responses classified by grade division. When teachers' concerns were examined on the basis of grade division, teachers in Division 1 were slightly more concerned (54 percent of concerns) about diagnostic assistance than Division 2 teachers who were more interested (54 percent of concerns) in general directions and information about planning individualized instruction.

Grouping for Instruction

The distribution of specific concerns for task area 14 when examined by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division is given in Table 30.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. The teachers with most concerns about dividing their class at the beginning of the year were those with three and four years of post-secondary education. Over 46 percent of the concern of teachers in all categories except those with four years of post-secondary education (29 percent of concerns) were about diagnosing the level of their students and whom to group together in the classes. Teachers with least and most years of post-secondary education were equally concerned about how to group their students for different skills.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. Forty-one percent of the concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience were in dividing their class at the beginning of the year while teachers with four to six years of teaching experience were most interested in information about grouping specific students (50 percent of concerns). This was also the case for teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience (50 percent of concerns) who had an equal percentage of their concerns about grouping for skill development.

Table 30

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 14 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 14 - Grouping for instruction

Specific Concerns

1. Dividing class at the beginning of year
2. Grouping for different skills
3. Information on level of students/Whom to group together/ Use of group leaders

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	0.0	40.0	32.3	9.1	40.9	18.8	0.0	30.0	0.0
2.	50.0	10.0	38.7	45.5	31.8	31.3	50.0	40.0	0.0
3.	50.0	50.0	29.0	45.5	27.3	50.0	50.0	30.0	0.0
N	4	10	31	11	22	16	8	10	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	23.1	25.0	35.7	24.0	32.0
2.	34.6	43.8	28.6	36.0	32.0
3.	42.3	31.3	35.7	40.0	36.0
N	26	16	14	25	25

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. The percentage of concerns about dividing a class at the beginning of the school year increased with years of employment in the school. Teachers new to the school were most interested in obtaining information on the level of students and whom to group together. Teachers in their second year in the school had 44 percent of their concerns in grouping for different skills.

Responses classified by grade division. Division 1 teachers were more interested in grouping for different skills and in information on the level of students than were Division 2 teachers. The concerns of Division 2 teachers were approximately equally divided among all three concerns with a slightly higher percentage (36 percent) of concerns in information on the level of students and whom to group together.

Operating Audio-Visual Equipment

Table 31 contains the distribution of specific concerns for task area 15 by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Regardless of length of post-secondary education, two-thirds of teachers' concerns were in operating or obtaining audio-visual equipment and one-third with maintenance problems.

Table 31

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 15 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 15 - Operating audio-visual equipment

Specific Concerns

1. Operation/Availability
2. Maintenance

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	62.5	71.4	66.7	72.7	77.8	38.5	87.5	66.7	66.7
2.	37.5	28.6	33.3	27.3	22.2	61.5	12.5	33.3	33.3
N	8	14	27	11	27	13	8	9	3

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	78.6	70.6	46.7	70.8	64.0
2.	21.4	29.4	53.3	29.2	36.0
N	28	17	15	24	25

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. While the general trend was for teachers in all categories to have at least twice as many concerns about operation as about maintenance of audio-visual equipment, teachers with four to six years of teaching experience had only 39 percent of their concerns about operation of equipment and 62 percent about maintenance problems.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Over 70 percent of the concerns of teachers in their first and second year of teaching in the school were about obtaining and operating audio-visual equipment, while teachers who had been employed in the school for three to ten years had almost equal concerns about operation and maintenance.

Responses classified by grade division. Approximately two-thirds of teachers' concerns regardless of grade division were operating concerns and one-third were maintenance concerns. A slightly higher percentage of the concerns of Division 2 teachers (36 percent) than of those of Division 1 teachers (29 percent) were about maintenance problems.

Using Kits, Charts, Games, Simulations

The distribution of responses for task area 16 by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division, is given in Table 32.

Table 32

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 16 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 16 - Using kits, charts, games, simulations

Specific Concerns

1. What kits to use/How to use
2. Information on what materials available/What new materials available

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	50.0	63.6	45.5	42.9	52.4	50.0	50.0	33.3	0.0
2.	50.0	36.4	54.6	57.1	47.6	50.0	50.0	66.7	0.0
N	2	11	22	7	21	12	6	3	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	52.6	41.2	66.7	56.5	42.9
2.	47.4	58.8	33.3	43.5	57.1
N	19	17	6	23	14

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. In general, teachers were equally concerned about obtaining information about the range of available materials and how to choose and use kits, although teachers with three years of post-secondary education were more interested in operational information, how to use the material, and teachers with four and five to six years of post-secondary education had more concerns in the range of available materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. Teachers with fewer than ten years of teaching experience had equal concerns in both the choice and the range of audio-visual materials available. Teachers with more than ten years of teaching experience were more interested (66 percent of concerns) in the range of available materials than in how to choose and use kits (33 percent of concerns).

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Fifty-three percent of concerns of teachers in their first year of employment in the school were in the use of audio-visual materials, while 59 percent of teachers in their second year teaching in the school desired information on the range of available materials. In comparison, two-thirds of the concerns of teachers who had been employed at the school for at least two years were in how to choose and use kits.

Responses classified by grade division. Fifty-seven percent of the concerns of Division 1 teachers related to the use of materials while 57 percent of the concerns of Division 2 teachers were about the range of available audio-visual materials.

Developing Own Audio-Visual Materials

The distribution of responses for task area 17 by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school and grade division, is given in Table 33.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education had no concerns about making audio-visual materials, while 57 percent of the concerns of those with three years of training and 50 percent of the concerns of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education were in this area.

Sixty-two percent of the concerns of teachers with four years of post-secondary education and all the concerns of teachers with one to two years of training were related to getting ideas, gearing the material to the level of the students, knowing what basic materials were available or getting enough time to make the materials.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. The percentage of concerns about making specific materials increased with years of experience, except for teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience. Only 33 percent of their concerns were in this area while 67 percent were related to getting ideas and time, obtaining basic materials, and gearing the materials to the level of the students.

Table 33

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 17 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 17 - Developing own audio-visual materials

Specific Concerns

1. Making specific materials
2. Getting ideas/Gearing to level of students/Knowing what is available/Getting enough time

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2	3	4	5-6	1-3	4-6	7-10	11-20	20+
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
1.	0.0	57.1	37.5	50.0	40.0	50.0	33.3	66.7	0.0
2.	100.0	42.9	62.5	50.0	60.0	50.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
N	1	7	8	6	10	6	3	3	0

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1	2	3-10	1	2
	%	%	%	%	%
1.	36.4	0.0	66.7	33.3	83.3
2.	63.6	100.0	33.3	66.7	16.7
N	11	2	9	12	6

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. New teachers and especially those in their second year of teaching in the school were not concerned about making specific materials. The reverse was true for teachers with at least two years of employment in the school. Eighty-three percent of their concerns were related to making the materials and only 17 percent to getting ideas, time and materials together to make the specific materials.

Responses classified by grade division. Two-thirds of the concerns of Division 1 teachers were in obtaining ideas and the necessary equipment while Division 2 teachers desired more assistance in making specific materials (83 percent of their concerns).

Obtaining Student-Background Information

The distribution of responses for task area 20 classified by years of post-secondary education, total years of teaching experience, years of employment in the school, and grade division is given in Table 34.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. Approximately 70 percent of teachers' concerns, regardless of length of post-secondary education, were in obtaining family-background information about students. Teachers with three years of post-secondary education had a slightly higher percentage of concerns (87 percent) in this area.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. The percentage of concerns about obtaining information on students'

Table 34

Distribution of Specific Concerns for Task Area 20 by Years of Post-Secondary Education, Total Years of Teaching Experience, Years of Employment in the School, and Grade Division

TASK AREA 20 - Obtaining student-background information

Specific Concerns

1. Information from other teachers re academic progress or from school records
2. Non-cumulative record card information (family background information)

	Years of Post-Secondary Education				Total Years of Teaching Experience				
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %	1-3 %	4-6 %	7-10 %	11-20 %	20+ %
1.	33.3	13.3	27.3	30.0	20.0	20.0	27.3	33.3	33.3
2.	66.7	86.7	72.7	70.0	80.0	80.0	72.7	66.7	66.7
N	6	15	22	10	20	10	11	9	3

	Years of Employment in the School			Grade Division	
	1 %	2 %	3-10 %	1 %	2 %
1.	19.2	30.8	28.6	13.0	25.0
2.	80.8	69.2	71.4	87.0	75.0
N	26	13	14	23	16

progress from other teachers or from school records increased slightly from 20 to 33 percent as years of teaching experience increased. Correspondingly, teachers with most experience were least interested in obtaining non-cumulative record card information.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. Teachers, regardless of length of employment in the school, were most concerned about obtaining family-background information. Eighty-one percent of the concerns of new teachers and approximately 70 percent of the concerns of teachers with two and three to ten years of employment in the school were in this area.

Responses classified by grade division. Thirteen percent of the concerns of Division 1 teachers and 25 percent of the concerns of Division 2 teachers were related to obtaining information from other teachers or from school records about a student's progress. Conversely, more teachers in Division 1 (87 percent of concerns) than in Division 2 (75 percent of concerns) wanted information about the family background of students.

SUMMARY

The specific concerns of teachers overall, for each task area, and when examined by selected teacher characteristics were presented in this chapter.

All Specific Concerns Combined

In general, teachers sought to discuss and exchange ideas about students, materials and teaching techniques, to obtain instructions in using certain teaching strategies, to overcome discrepancies in knowledge of subject matter and concepts, and to obtain assistance in diagnosing student learning difficulties and developing remedial programs.

Specific Concerns in Each Task Area

Developing course outlines. A desire to discuss and exchange ideas in "Developing course outlines" was most often indicated by teachers with more than three years of post-secondary education, those who were at least in their second year in the school and teachers in Division 1. Specific concerns about concepts and subject matter came most often from teachers with less than three years of post-secondary education, those with one to three years of teaching experience, teachers new to the school and Division 2 teachers.

Selecting instructional materials. Teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education and teachers new to the school were particularly concerned about what materials were available, while selecting materials to teach concepts was most often a concern of teachers with four or more years of post-secondary education and teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience.

Developing unit/lesson plans. All teachers regarded obtaining and exchanging ideas about "Developing unit/lesson plans" as their biggest concern, while a desire to plan cooperatively came most often from teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education, teachers with more than ten years of teaching experience, and those teachers in their first or second year teaching in their present school.

Developing instructional materials. Teachers in Division 2, those with less than four years of teaching experience, and teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education, wanted the most assistance in planning and obtaining materials. Concerns about making materials increased with years of teaching experience.

Evaluating lessons/units. The evaluation of instructional materials and lesson/unit plans was most often a concern of teachers in their first year of employment in the school, Division 1 teachers, and those with most years of post-secondary education. Of teachers who desired assistance in the post-evaluation of units and students, the highest percentages of concerns were from beginning teachers, those with seven to ten years of teaching experience and those who had taught in the school for at least two years.

Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations. Those teachers who expressed greatest concern about their knowledge of basic concepts were those who had one to two years of post-secondary education, those who had taught in the school for at least two years and Division 1 teachers. A desire to obtain more information about new ideas and techniques came most frequently from beginning teachers, teachers in their first year of teaching in the school and those in Division 2.

Developing/using small group activities. The most interested in obtaining ideas for activity centres were teachers who had taught in their present school for at least two years, and those who had four to six years of teaching experience. Concerns about ideas for small group work were expressed by beginning teachers and those new to the school. Approximately 25 percent of all concerns in all categories were about group motivation and appropriate work activities.

Planning individualized instruction. Division 1 teachers, those with at least seven years of teaching experience, and those with one to two years of post-secondary education were the most concerned about diagnosis of students' learning patterns and possible problems. Teachers with most years of post-secondary education, those with least years of teaching experience, those in their first year of employment in the school and teachers in Division 2 were the most interested in obtaining information on the technique itself and appropriate materials.

Grouping for instruction. The teachers who were most concerned about dividing their class at the beginning of the year had taught in the school for at least two years. Division 2 teachers and those who had three and four years of post-secondary education were also in this group.

Operating audio-visual equipment. Two-thirds of the concerns of teachers in all categories except those with four to six years of teaching experience or those who had taught in their present school for three to ten years, were about the operation of audio-visual equipment.

Using kits, charts, games, simulations. Division 2 teachers, those with eleven to twenty years of teaching experience and teachers in their second year of employment in their present school were most concerned about information on the range of available materials while teachers whose biggest concern was deciding which kit to use or how to use it were those with one to two years of post-secondary education, those with three to ten years of employment in the school, Division 1 teachers, and teachers with less than ten years of teaching experience.

Developing own audio-visual materials. Teachers with most concerns about making materials were in Division 2 or were teachers who had taught in the school for three to ten years. Getting ideas, materials or time was the primary concern of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education, those in their first or second year in the school and teachers in Division 1.

Obtaining student-background information. As years of teaching experience increased, teachers were more concerned about obtaining student progress information from cumulative record cards and from other teachers. Teachers in their first year of employment in the school, Division 1 teachers, and teachers with fewer than seven years of teaching experience were the most interested in obtaining family-background information about students.

Specific Concerns by Selected Teacher Characteristics

Teachers' specific concerns were also summarized according to selected teacher characteristics.

Responses classified by years of post-secondary education. In "Developing course outlines," the majority of concerns of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education (referred to as least qualified) and teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education (referred to as most qualified) were about what was expected of their pupils at their particular grade level.

In "Selecting instructional materials," while least qualified teachers were concerned about what was available in the school, most qualified teachers were also concerned about what materials were available generally.

In "Developing unit/lesson plans," least qualified teachers had the most concerns about exchanging ideas while most qualified teachers were interested in cooperative planning.

In "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," most qualified teachers had equal concerns about their lack of knowledge of basic concepts, how to handle problems, and obtaining new ideas and techniques, while for least qualified teachers 60 percent of their concerns were because they were unsure of basic concepts and/or would like feedback in specific subject areas.

In "Developing/using small group activities," most qualified teachers stressed exchanging activity centre ideas while least qualified teachers stressed small group work ideas.

Sixty-six percent of the concerns of least qualified teachers in "Planning for individualized instruction" were about diagnosis of students while most qualified teachers were more interested in obtaining information about specific subject areas and useful materials.

In the other task areas there was little difference in the responses of least qualified and most qualified teachers.

Responses classified by total years of teaching experience. In "Developing course outlines," 70 percent of the concerns of teachers with one to three years of teaching experience (referred to as beginning teachers) and 60 percent of the concerns of teachers with over ten years of teaching experience (referred to as experienced teachers) were about what was expected of their pupils at their grade level.

In "Selecting instructional materials," while beginning teachers were most concerned about what was available in the school, experienced teachers also wanted to know what instructional materials were available generally.

In "Developing unit/lesson plans," experienced teachers were the most interested in cooperative planning while in "Developing instructional materials," 61 percent of the concerns of beginning teachers were for planning and obtaining ideas and 63 percent of experienced teachers' concerns were about making/comparing notes and dittoing copies.

While beginning teachers were the most concerned about new ideas for teaching concepts, constructs, and generalizations, experienced teachers were chiefly concerned about their lack of knowledge about basic concepts, and a desire for feedback in certain subject areas.

In "Planning individualized instruction," experienced teachers had most concerns about diagnosis of their pupils and beginning teachers were more anxious to obtain information about specific subject areas.

Beginning teachers were concerned about dividing their classes at the beginning of the year while experienced teachers mentioned grouping for different skills as their most important concern.

In "Developing own audio-visual materials," experienced teachers were concerned about making specific materials while beginning teachers indicated that they lacked time, ideas, knowledge and resources.

Experienced teachers had fewer concerns than beginning teachers about obtaining student family-background information.

Responses classified by years of employment in the school. The concerns of new teachers (those in their first year of employment in the school) differed from those of longest employed teachers (those with three to ten years of employment in the school) in a number of task areas.

While the majority of the concerns of new teachers in "Developing course outlines" was with what was expected at their grade level, this was a less prominent concern of longest employed teachers.

In "Selecting instructional materials," the longest employed teachers were more concerned about what materials were available generally, than were new teachers.

While new teachers were concerned about exchanging materials in "Developing unit/lesson plans" longest employed teachers were more interested in exchanging ideas.

The majority of the concerns of new teachers were for evaluation of instructional materials in "Evaluating lesson/unit plans," while 57 percent of the concerns of longest employed teachers were for post-evaluation of a unit or of their students.

In "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations," longest employed teachers were more concerned about lack of knowledge of basic concepts than were new teachers.

While new teachers stressed small group ideas, longest employed teachers stressed activity centre ideas in "Developing/using small group activities."

In "Grouping for instruction," new teachers were interested in obtaining information on the level of students and which pupils to group together while longest employed teachers were concerned about dividing their classes at the beginning of the school year.

Sixty-seven percent of the concerns of longest employed teachers in "Developing own audio-visual materials" were about making specific materials while 64 percent of new teachers' concerns were about lack of time, ideas, knowledge and resources.

Chapter 7

PROVISION OF CONSULTATION

This chapter contains an analysis of the data for problems 3 to 7, concerning provision of consultation. Teachers' choice of consultants, in general and in relation to selected background variables as well as teachers' perceptions of themselves as consultants and their rating of the consultative assistance which they obtained, are examined. Problem 3 asked:

"Whom did teachers ask for assistance?"

SUB-PROBLEM 3.1

Statement. "How many persons did each teacher consult?"

The total number of personnel consulted by each teacher is given in Table 35. Although the number of consultants chosen by individual teachers varied from one to nineteen, the means for each school were very similar varying between 7.5 and 7.9.

Findings in small group research point to seven as being the maximum number for a group, beyond which sub-groups occur, (James:1951, 474-477). While consultants may not form a group in the generally accepted sense, they may be regarded by the individual teacher as such, i.e., as his consultation group.

SUB-PROBLEM 3.2

Statement. "Which teachers were consulted most often?"

Table 35

Total Number of Personnel Consulted by Each Teacher
During September-February Period

Teacher No.	No. of Personnel Consulted*	Teacher No.	No. of Personnel Consulted	Teacher No.	No. of Personnel Consulted
4	12	31	10	63	8
5	1	32	5	64	6
6	17	33	6	65	7
7	7	34	7	66	7
8	12	35	12	67	6
9	11	36	6	74	9
10	11	37	7	75	7
11	7	38	6	76	17
12	8	44	7	77	12
13	9	45	10	78	2
14	5	46	2	79	5
15	8	47	6	80	8
16	10	48	1	81	9
17	10	49	8	82	1
18	6	50	6	83	1
19	1	51	9	84	12
20	10	52	4	85	16
21	0	53	13	86	6
22	7	54	8	87	2
23	8	55	7	88	4
24	8	56	6	89	14
25	9	57	10	90	9
26	6	58	11	91	6
27	7	59	6	92	10
28	9	60	10	93	2
29	2	61	4	94	7
30	7	62	19	95	11

*This includes central office personnel, school nurse, secretary, aides.

Mean No. of Personnel Consulted: School 1 = 7.85
School 2 = 7.54
School 3 = 7.72

The number of times each teacher was consulted in each task area and in each section is given in Tables 36 to 38. Teacher numbers 1, 2 and 3 referred to central office personnel and were not included in the analysis.

School 1

While teachers asked for assistance from some colleagues more often than others, there were no teachers that had not been consulted in at least two areas.

Curriculum and program task areas. The teachers consulted most often in this section were nos. 33, 28, 27, 25, 26 and 13. Teacher 33 was the principal and teacher 25 the assistant principal, teachers 26 and 27 taught Grade 5, teacher 28 taught Grade 6, and teacher 13 taught Grade 1. While the teachers were consulted approximately an equal number of times in task areas one to four, the principal (33) and the assistant principal (25) were each consulted by seven persons in the selection of instructional materials, task area two.

Instructional task areas. Teachers 24, 27, 32, 33, 19 and 28 were all consulted at least eight times in this section. All teachers except teacher 19 were in Division 2 and teachers 32 and 33 were the guidance counsellor and the principal respectively.

Audio-visual technology task areas. The librarian, no. 8, who was in charge of all audio-visual equipment, kits, charts, games, etc., was the person consulted most often in this section. Teacher 29, who had previously been in charge of the audio-visual

Table 36

Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 1

TASK AREA	Teacher Code Numbers																																					
No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM																																						
1.	0	4	0	3	0	1	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0
2.	0	4	0	2	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3	1	0	1	3	2	0	1	2	7	4	2	3	0	0	1	1	7	0	1	1	2	1
3.	0	3	0	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	3	1	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	2	3	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0
4.	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	2	0	2	2	2	3	0	2	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	2	2
5.	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
6.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	16	0	7	2	8	5	9	4	3	6	7	10	9	7	8	9	2	7	6	7	5	6	12	10	10	11	13	0	6	4	2	14	4	2	2	6	3
INSTRUCTIONAL																																						
7.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	0	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1
9.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	0	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
11.	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	3	3	1	0	0	1	1
12.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
13.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	5	2	0	1	0	0	1
Total	0	15	0	7	0	4	5	3	1	0	1	4	2	4	1	3	3	1	8	7	4	0	4	9	4	3	9	8	0	4	5	9	9	3	1	0	2	3
AUDIO-VISUAL TECH.																																						
15.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16.	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
17.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	7	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS																																						
18.	0	12	4	7	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	2	3	1	1	0	21	13	0	4	0	1	0
19.	0	13	2	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	7	6	0	4	0	1	2
20.	0	2	1	4	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	2	1	4	0	2	4	0	1	2	9	10	0	0	0	0	0
21.	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	2	3	3	2	2	0	10	11	0	0	0	0	1
Total	0	27	7	20	2	5	2	0	1	0	1	1	4	16	5	4	1	2	10	0	1	0	6	4	17	5	8	12	3	5	2	47	40	0	8	0	2	3
Overall Total	0	61	7	35	4	19	12	49	6	3	8	12	17	30	13	15	13	5	27	14	12	5	17	26	32	20	30	35	10	17	11	58	64	7	11	2	12	10

Table 37

Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 2

TASK AREA	Teacher Code Numbers																										
No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM																											
1.	1	3	0	7	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	1
2.	1	3	0	8	2	0	0	0	3	1	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	1
3.	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
4.	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
5.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
6.	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total	2	9	0	18	9	2	1	5	5	4	2	6	3	4	5	7	0	5	0	0	1	0	8	1	1	7	6
INSTRUCTIONAL																											
7.	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8.	0	1	0	2	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
9.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
11.	1	3	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
12.	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
13.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
14.	1	3	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	4	9	1	10	5	4	3	5	1	1	1	0	4	3	0	1	0	4	0	0	3	0	6	2	0	0	6
AUDIO-VISUAL TECH.																											
15.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0
16.	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	2
17.	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Total	0	2	0	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	8	4
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS																											
18.	0	9	6	11	2	1	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
19.	0	5	2	5	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4
20.	0	1	2	3	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
21.	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total	0	16	10	25	4	2	19	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	5	0	0	2	24	0	1	1	6	1	1	0	9
Overall Total	6	36	11	57	23	8	23	13	7	6	5	8	8	10	14	9	0	11	25	0	5	1	24	4	2	15	25

5

Table 38

Number of Times Each Teacher Was Consulted in Each Task Area and in Each Section in School 3

TASK AREA No.	Teacher Code Numbers 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM																									
1.	0	1	0	3	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	3	1	1
2.	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	1	0	7	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	2	2	0
3.	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	2	2	4	0	1	1	4	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	1	2
4.	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0
5.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
6.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1
Total	0	4	0	9	1	9	6	9	14	12	1	10	2	9	2	7	0	1	4	7	6	8	9	7	4
INSTRUCTIONAL																									
7.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
8.	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0
9.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10.	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	1
11.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	0
12.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1
13.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14.	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	2	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	2
Total	0	3	3	4	0	4	2	5	16	5	1	0	4	6	4	3	0	11	1	2	1	4	5	2	4
AUDIO-VISUAL TECH.																									
15.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	0	2	0	0
16.	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3	1	1	1
17.	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	13	2	4	3	1	1
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS																									
18.	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	12	0	1	0	0	2	0	1
19.	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
20.	0	0	6	0	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
21.	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	8	0	1
Total	1	10	18	1	0	1	0	0	34	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	28	1	1	0	1	12	0	3
Overall Total	1	17	21	17	2	15	11	14	64	17	4	12	10	17	7	11	1	42	6	23	9	17	29	10	12

equipment, was consulted by seven teachers.

Special student needs task areas. The principal, the assistant principal, the guidance counsellor, teachers 4 and 14 who were involved in remedial work, and teacher 28, a Grade 6 teacher, were consulted most often in this section.

Teachers consulted most often overall. The principal, assistant principal, guidance counsellor, librarian, and teachers 4, 14, 27, and 28 were all consulted on at least 30 occasions between September and February, 1974.

Teachers 4 and 14 were involved in remedial work, and teachers 27 and 28 were Grade 5 and 6 teachers respectively. None of the teachers were grade coordinators.

School 2

The number of consultations per teacher ranged from 0 to 57, and of the 24 teachers on staff, all but two were consulted at least once.

Curriculum and program task areas. Teachers 4, 5, 16, 23 and 26 were consulted most often in this section. These were the principal (4), the librarian (26), two grade 1 teachers (5 and 23) and a split grade 4-5 teacher (16). Teachers 4 and 16 were consulted most often about developing course outlines, and the principal and the librarian were most often consulted about selecting materials.

Instructional task areas. Seven teachers were not consulted and eleven teachers were consulted less than five times in this section.

Teachers most often consulted were 4, 5, 8, 23, and 27. They included the principal, teacher 8 who taught Grade 3 and was most often consulted about teaching concepts, two grade 1 teachers, 5 and 23 and teacher aide 27.

Audio-visual technology task areas. In all there were 32 consultations in this section. The person consulted most often was the librarian (26) who was in charge of equipment, kits, charts and games. The three Grade 1 teachers (5, 15 and 23) and the Grade 1 teacher aide (27) were all consulted about choosing and using kits and making audio-visual materials. The other person consulted at least four times was the principal.

Special student needs task areas. The teachers consulted most often in this section were the principal (4), the guidance counsellor (19), the remedial reading teacher (7) and the Grade 1 teacher aide (27). The guidance counsellor was consulted on nine occasions about diagnosing learning difficulties.

Teachers consulted most often overall. The principal (4), the guidance counsellor (19), the Grade 1 teacher aide (27), two Grade 1 teachers (5 and 23) and the remedial reading teacher (7) were the persons most often chosen as consultants in School 2.

School 3.

Of the twenty-two teachers on staff, all were consulted on at least one occasion.

Curriculum and program task areas. Three teachers, 9, 10 and 12 were consulted most often in this section. They were the assistant principal (9), the librarian (12), and a Grade 4 teacher (10). The assistant principal and the librarian were consulted most often about selecting instructional materials while two Grade 4 teachers, 10 and 14 were the teachers most often consulted about developing unit/lesson plans.

Instructional task areas. Teachers 9 and 18, the assistant principal and the remedial reading teacher respectively, were most often consulted on instructional questions, especially in two areas, planning individualized instruction, and grouping for instruction.

Audio-visual technology task areas. A Grade 3 teacher, 20, was most often consulted in this section. The person previously in charge of audio-visual equipment had been the previous school secretary. Since her departure, teachers consulted teacher 20 who was not in charge of the equipment but was knowledgeable about the operation and maintenance of audio-visual equipment.

Special student needs task areas. The principal, assistant principal, and remedial reading teacher were all frequently consulted. The assistant principal (9) who was also responsible for Guidance and the remedial reading teacher (18) were most often asked about diagnosis of learning difficulties, while the remedial reading teacher was the source of most assistance in developing remedial programs. The principal (23) and assistant principal handled most student-teacher problems.

Teachers consulted most often overall. The teachers consulted most often overall were teachers 9, 18, 20 and 23. The assistant principal (9) was consulted on 64 occasions. Other personnel consulted at least 23 times were the principal, the remedial reading teacher (18), and the Grade 3 teacher (20) who provided most assistance with audio-visual problems.

SUB-PROBLEM 3.3

Statement. "To what extent did teachers who were consulted most often overall differ from their colleagues in:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,
3. length of employment in the school system,
4. length of employment in their present school,
5. grade division,
6. formal position, and
7. sex?"

Only in those instances when there was a statistically significant difference on a background variable between teachers most often consulted and their colleagues was the distribution examined.

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

The distribution of responses by years of post-secondary education is shown in Table 39.

Table 39

Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Years of Post-Secondary Education

	Years of Post-Secondary Education			
	1-2 %	3 %	4 %	5-6 %
Teachers Most Often Consulted	10.0	29.4	12.8	50.0
Colleagues	90.0	70.6	87.2	50.0
N	10 100.0	17 100.0	39 100.0	14 100.0

Chi square = 9.52 p = .02

Table 40

Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Formal Position

	Formal Position	
	Teachers %	Other Position Holders %
Teachers Most Often Consulted	14.5	72.7
Colleagues	85.5	27.3
N	69 100.0	11 100.0

Chi square = 15.26 p = .000

While 50 percent of teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education were most often chosen as consultants, only 10 percent of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education were chosen most often. Twenty-nine percent of teachers with three years of post-secondary education and 13 percent of those in the four years category were also consulted most often.

Responses Classified by Formal Position

While 15 percent of classroom teachers were in the most often consulted category (Table 40), 73 percent of those who held formal positions were consulted most often.

Responses Classified by Sex

Of the 61 female teachers, 15 percent were most often chosen as consultants (Table 41), while 47 percent of the 19 males were also in this category.

The teachers who were consulted most often were more often male, with five to six years of post-secondary education and in a formal position other than classroom teacher.

PROBLEM 4

Problem 4 was concerned with teachers perceptions of themselves as consultants. Specifically, the problem stated:

"Did teachers view themselves as providing consultative assistance to others?"

Sub-Problem 4.1

Statement. "For how many of their colleagues did teachers

Table 41

Distribution of Teachers Most Often Consulted and Their Colleagues by Sex

	Sex Female %	 Male %
Teachers Most Often Consulted	14.8	47.4
Colleagues	85.2	52.6
N	61 100.0	19 100.0

Chi square = 7.07 p = .007

indicate that they had provided consultative assistance?"

The numbers of personnel for whom each teacher indicated providing consultative assistance are shown in Table 42.

School 1

In school 1 with 34 staff members, the librarian (8), the principal (33), and the guidance counsellor (32) felt that they had been asked for assistance by all other 33 teachers. The assistant principal (25) indicated providing consultative assistance for 24 teachers and the remainder of the staff ranged in their provision of assistance from one to twelve persons. Teacher 21 left the staff just before the data were collected, hence the absence of information.

School 2

In school 2 with 24 staff members, the number of persons for whom consultation had been provided ranged from one to twenty-three. The librarian (26) thought that she had provided assistance for all other staff members. The guidance counsellor (19) indicated providing assistance for 22 teachers while the principal (4) and assistant principal (9) suggested that they had assisted 19 and 18 staff respectively.

School 3

Of the twenty-two teachers on staff, the principal (23) and the librarian (12) indicated that they had provided assistance to all other staff members. The assistant principal (9) suggested providing assistance to 19 teachers and the remedial reading teacher

Table 42

Number of Personnel for Whom Each Teacher Indicated the Provision of Consultative Assistance

Teacher No.	No. of Personnel	Teacher No.	No. of Personnel	Teacher No.	No. of Personnel
School 1					
4	12	16	4	28	10
5	1	17	3	29	3
6	4	18	3	30	6
7	4	19	5	31	3
8	33	20	4	32	31
9	4	21	0	33	33
10	6	22	1	34	3
11	6	23	6	35	10
12	5	24	2	36	4
13	2	25	24	37	4
14	10	26	3	38	3
15	10	27	2		
School 2					
4	19	12	16	20	6
5	4	13	8	21	1
6	2	14	5	22	1
7	8	15	3	23	11
8	1	16	15	24	5
9	18	17	12	25	1
10	9	18	7	26	23
11	3	19	22	27	4
School 3					
4	5	12	21	20	16
5	1	13	2	21	6
6	8	14	5	22	9
7	9	15	6	23	21
8	6	16	5	24	4
9	19	17	4	25	8
10	6	18	16		
11	6	19	9		

Mean No. of persons for whom each teacher provided consultation.

School 1 = 8.3
School 2 = 8.4
School 3 = 8.7

thought that 18 teachers had asked her for assistance.

Sub-Problem 4.2

Statement. "How many times was each teacher named as consultant?"

The number of times each teacher was identified as a source of consultative assistance ranged from 64 to zero. (Table 43).

Two teachers in School 2 were not asked to provide consultative assistance. The mean number of times teachers were named as consultants for each school varied from 13 times for School 2, 16 times for School 3 to 17 times for School 1.

Sub-Problem 4.3

Statement. "To what extent were teachers in agreement with others in their estimation of themselves as consultants?"

The extent of congruence between teachers' perceptions of themselves as consultants and the teachers named as consultants is shown in Table 44.

While in many cases the number of persons for whom teachers indicated providing consultative assistance and the number of persons who named the teacher as consultant were similar, an examination of the actual congruence between choices showed wide variations.

School 1

In 40 percent of the total number of interactions where teachers indicated that they had provided consultative assistance, these teachers were named as consultants. When examined in reverse, in 43 percent of those interactions where teachers were named as

Table 43

Number of Times Each Teacher Was Named as Consultant

Teacher No.	No. of Times	Teacher No.	No. of Times	Teacher No.	No. of Times
School 1					
4	35	16	15	28	35
5	4	17	13	29	10
6	19	18	5	30	17
7	12	19	27	31	11
8	49	20	14	32	58
9	6	21	12	33	64
10	3	22	5	34	7
11	8	23	17	35	11
12	12	24	26	36	2
13	17	25	32	37	12
14	30	26	20	38	10
15	13	27	30		
School 2					
4	57	12	8	20	0
5	23	13	8	21	5
6	8	14	10	22	1
7	23	15	14	23	24
8	13	16	9	24	4
9	7	17	0	25	2
10	6	18	5	26	15
11	5	19	25	27	25
School 3					
4	17	12	12	20	23
5	2	13	10	21	9
6	15	14	17	22	17
7	11	15	7	23	29
8	14	16	11	24	10
9	64	17	1	25	12
10	17	18	42		
11	4	19	6		

Mean No. of times teachers were named as consultants.

School 1 = 16.5
School 2 = 12.6
School 3 = 15.9

Table 44

Percentage Comparisons of Interactions Where Teachers Perceived Themselves as Consultants and Interactions Where Teachers Were Named as Consultants, for Each School

(a) Of Interactions Where Teachers Indicated Providing Consultative Assistance

Teacher Was Named as Consultant		School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes		40.2	32.4	35.4
No		59.8	67.7	64.2
	N	264 100.0	204 100.0	192 100.0

(b) Of Interactions Where Teachers Were Named as Consultants

Teacher Indicated Providing Consultative Assistance		School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes		42.9	50.4	46.8
No		57.1	49.6	51.4
	N	247 100.0	131 100.0	140 100.0

consultants, the teachers perceived themselves as having provided consultation.

Fifty-seven percent of interactions were either not perceived as such or not remembered since teachers did not indicate that they had provided consultative assistance.

School 2

There was a lower percentage of congruent perceptions from the teachers in School 2.

Thirty-two percent of the interactions where teachers felt that they had provided consultative assistance were also viewed as such by the recipients, but for 50 percent of the interactions where teachers were named as consultants they did not indicate the provision of consultative assistance.

School 3

The percentage of congruent perceptions for School 3 was similar to that of School 2.

In 35 percent of the interactions where teachers indicated providing consultative assistance, they were named as consultants. In another 65 percent, however, the recipient did not either perceive or remember themselves as seeking consultative assistance.

In 51 percent of the interactions where teachers were named as consultants, teachers did not indicate the provision of consultative assistance.

Since, in answering the question about provision of consultative assistance, many teachers indicated the specific concerns for which they had provided consultative assistance, it is probable that many more teachers were consulted especially about students and instructional materials than were named as consultants. Reasons why they were not named as consultants might be that the interaction had been forgotten, or perceived as casual school talk and not as a search for assistance.

Sub-Problem 4.4

Statement. "How often did teachers say they had provided consultative assistance?"

The distribution of teacher responses by perceived frequency of provision of consultative assistance is shown in Table 45.

The majority of teachers (62 percent) indicated that they were asked for assistance "at least twice a week," 22 percent felt that they provided assistance "approximately twice a month," and 17 percent rated their provision of assistance as "Infrequent."

PROBLEM 5

Problem 5 stated:

"Were teachers satisfied with the consultative assistance which they obtained?"

Sub-Problem 5.1

Statement. "What rating did teachers give the consultative assistance which they obtained?"

Teachers were asked to rate the information supplied by each consultant, hence for each task area 100 percent is the number of ratings in that task area.

Table 45

Distribution of Teachers by Perceived Frequency of Provision of Consultative Assistance

Frequency of Assistance	f	%
At least twice a week	50	62.0
Approximately twice a month	17	21.5
Infrequently	13	16.5
N	80	100.0

Overall, teachers were satisfied with the information which they received from the teachers who provided assistance for them. Of the 80 teachers only 5 had concerns where they were unable to find a satisfactory answer. One teacher was new to the staff and the school, one teacher was unhappy at the level of interaction with her fellow grade teacher, and three were specialists with no other teachers teaching that subject in the school.

Of the 1545 consultations, in 123 the consultant was unable to provide information that was satisfactory for the client. The distribution of teachers' ratings of consultative assistance in each task area is given in Table 46.

Teachers' ratings of assistance as "Very Satisfactory" ranged from 11 to 100 percent and their ratings of assistance as "Not Very Satisfactory" ranged from zero to 33 percent.

Curriculum and Program Task Areas

Teachers were most satisfied with the interactions they had concerning "Selecting instructional materials," where 56 percent of consultations were "Very Satisfactory" and only 3 percent were "Not Very Satisfactory."

In "Developing unit/lesson plans" and "Evaluating lessons/units," teachers were generally satisfied with the assistance which they received but rated only approximately 30 percent of consultations as "Very Satisfactory." In "Developing course outlines" and "Developing instructional materials," approximately 7 percent of consultations were "Not Very Satisfactory" and about 50 percent were "Satisfactory." Teachers were most dissatisfied with the information they received about "Interpreting curriculum guides." Here, 33 percent of

Table 46

Distribution of Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance in Each Task Area

TASK AREA No. Description	Rating of Assistance Very Satisfactory %	 Satisfactory %	 Not Very Satisfactory %	 No. of Ratings
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM				
1. Developing course outlines	40.3	52.2	7.5	134*
2. Selecting instructional materials	56.2	40.9	2.9	137
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	34.4	62.2	3.3	90
4. Developing instructional materials	44.9	49.4	5.6	89
5. Evaluating lessons/units	30.0	66.7	3.3	30
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	11.1	55.6	33.3	27
INSTRUCTIONAL				
7. Developing questioning techniques	22.2	66.7	11.1	9
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	23.0	65.6	11.5	61
9. Planning role-playing	18.2	81.8	0.0	11
10. Developing/using small group activities	42.1	45.6	12.3	57
11. Planning individualized instruction	40.3	44.2	15.6	77
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	60.0	15.0	25.0	20
13. Leading discussions	100.0	0.0	0.0	4
14. Grouping for instruction	36.8	52.6	10.5	76
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY				
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	69.3	30.7	0.0	75
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	58.1	41.9	0.0	62
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	44.8	51.7	3.5	29
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS				
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	43.9	44.4	11.7	214
19. Developing remedial programs	44.2	45.7	10.1	129
20. Obtaining student-background information	50.9	46.4	2.7	112
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	40.2	51.0	8.8	102

*Each N = 100.0

consultations were "Not Very Satisfactory" and only 11 percent were "Very Satisfactory."

Instructional Task Areas

Teachers consulted fewer people in this section and were generally less satisfied with the information which they obtained.

Approximately 22 percent of consultations about "Developing questioning techniques" and "Teaching concepts" were rated "Very Satisfactory" and another 67 percent were "Satisfactory." However, 11 percent of consultations were considered "Not Very Satisfactory."

There was a similar rating pattern in "Developing/using small group activities" and "Grouping for instruction" where approximately 40 percent of consultations were "Very Satisfactory," 40 percent were "Satisfactory" and 11 percent were "Not Very Satisfactory."

In "Planning role-playing," teachers rated the 11 consultations as "Satisfactory" (82 percent) or "Very Satisfactory" (18 percent). Of the 4 consultations about "Leading discussions" all were rated "Very Satisfactory."

The highest percentages of "Not Very Satisfactory" ratings were in two areas, "Planning individualized instruction" (16 percent) and "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method" (25 percent). While 40 percent of consultations in "Planning individualized instruction" were considered "Very Satisfactory," 60 percent of those in "Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method" were also in this category suggesting a wide range in satisfaction possibly due to choice of consultant.

Audio-Visual Technology Task Areas

Teachers were satisfied with all consultations about the operation of audio-visual equipment and the use of kits, charts, games, simulations, etc. They were also fairly satisfied with the assistance which they received concerning "Developing own audio-visual materials" where only 4 percent of consultations were rated "Not Very Satisfactory."

Special Student Needs Task Areas

In "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Developing remedial programs," equal percentages of teachers (44 percent) rated the assistance which they received as "Very Satisfactory" and another 45 percent rated it "Satisfactory." However, approximately 11 percent were dissatisfied with the information which they obtained.

In "Obtaining student-background information," 51 percent of consultations were rated "Very Satisfactory" and another 46 percent as "Satisfactory." Nine percent of consultations about "Solving teacher-pupil problems" proved to be "Not Very Satisfactory" while 40 percent were considered "Very Satisfactory."

SUB-PROBLEM 5.2

Statement. "To what extent were differences in the distribution of ratings of assistance associated with:

1. years of post-secondary education,
2. total years of teaching experience,

3. years of employment in their present school,
4. grade division,
5. formal position, and
6. the school staffs?"

Responses Classified by Years of Post-Secondary Education

The distribution of teachers' ratings of assistance by years of post-secondary education is shown in Table 47.

In general, teachers' satisfaction decreased and dissatisfaction increased with increasing years of post-secondary education. While teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education rated 58 percent of their consultations as "Very Satisfactory" and only 4 percent as "Not Very Satisfactory," teachers with five to six years of post-secondary education indicated that only 33 percent of their consultations were "Very Satisfactory" and 11 percent were "Not Very Satisfactory."

Responses Classifed by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Teachers with one to three years of teaching experience rated 48 percent of their consultations as "Very Satisfactory" and only 8 percent as "Not Very Satisfactory" (Table 48) while teachers in the four to six years category, who were also generally satisfied with the assistance which they received, rated only 37 percent as "Very Satisfactory." Those teachers who had over 20 years of teaching experience were the most dissatisfied, as they rated 26 percent of their consultations as "Not Very Satisfactory."

Table 47

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Years of Post-Secondary Education

Ratings of Assistance	Years of Post-Secondary Education 1-2 %	 3 %	 4 %	 5-6 %
Very Satisfactory	58.5	44.1	45.3	33.2
Satisfactory	37.0	49.1	46.6	55.7
Not Very Satisfactory	4.4	6.8	8.1	11.1
N	135 100.0	397 100.0	751 100.0	262 100.0

Table 48

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Total Years of Teaching Experience

Ratings of Assistance	Total Years of Teaching Experience 1-3 %	 4-6 %	 7-10 %	 11-20 %	 20+ %
Very Satisfactory	48.0	36.7	45.3	45.2	43.5
Satisfactory	44.1	54.1	47.9	50.8	30.4
Not Very Satisfactory	7.9	9.2	6.8	4.0	26.1
N	596 100.0	390 100.0	263 100.0	250 100.0	46 100.0

Responses Classified by Years of Employment in the School

In general, there was little difference in the ratings of teachers regardless of length of employment in the school (Table 49). Fifty-one percent of the consultations of teachers new to the school were rated "Satisfactory" while 48 percent of teachers in their second year of teaching in the school rated the assistance which they received as "Very Satisfactory." Teachers with three or more years of employment in the school rated 46 percent of their consultations as "Satisfactory" and 45 percent as "Very Satisfactory." Approximately 8 percent of consultations in each category were rated "Not Very Satisfactory."

Responses Classified by Grade Division

Teachers in Division 1 rated 48 percent of their consultations as "Very Satisfactory" while Division 2 teachers rated only 38 percent as "Very Satisfactory" (Table 50). A higher percentage of Division 2 teachers (10 percent) than Division 1 teachers (7 percent) found their assistance to be "Not Very Satisfactory."

Responses Classified by Formal Position

In general, teachers were more satisfied with the assistance which they obtained than were other position holders (Table 51).

Teachers rated 45 percent of their consultations as "Very Satisfactory" and 8 percent as "Not Very Satisfactory." Fourteen percent of interactions initiated by other position holders were rated "Not Very Satisfactory" and only 38 percent of consultations

Table 49

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Years of Employment in the School

Ratings of Assistance	Years of Employment in the School 1 %	 2 %	 3-10 %
Very Satisfactory	41.2	47.9	45.2
Satisfactory	51.5	43.7	46.2
Not Very Satisfactory	7.4	8.4	8.6
N	719 100.0	430 100.0	396 100.0

Table 50

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Grade Division

Ratings of Assistance	Grade Division 1 %	 2 %
Very Satisfactory	47.7	37.9
Satisfactory	45.4	52.1
Not Very Satisfactory	6.9	9.9
N	736 100.0	564 100.0

Table 51

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by Formal Position

Ratings of Assistance		Formal Position Teachers %	 Other Position Holders %
Very Satisfactory		44.7	37.6
Satisfactory		47.9	48.8
Not Very Satisfactory		7.5	13.6
	N	1420 100.0	125 100.0

Table 52

Teachers' Ratings of Consultative Assistance by School Staffs

Ratings of Assistance		School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Very Satisfactory		48.2	44.0	36.8
Satisfactory		44.7	48.0	53.7
Not Very Satisfactory		7.1	8.0	9.5
	N	733 100.0	402 100.0	410 100.0

Chi square = 13.94 p = .008

were rated "Very Satisfactory."

Responses Classified by School Staffs

When the ratings of the three schools were examined (Table 52), teachers in School 1 were more satisfied with the consultative assistance which they received than were teachers in Schools 2 and 3. Forty-eight percent of interactions were rated "Very Satisfactory" in School 1 compared to 37 percent in School 3. Accordingly, 10 percent of consultations in School 3 were rated "Not Very Satisfactory" compared to 8 percent for School 2 and 7 percent for School 1.

PROBLEM 6

This problem examined the reasons why a teacher might desire but not seek consultative assistance. In particular, the problem stated:

> "Did teachers desire but not seek consultative assistance?"

Sub-Problem 6.1

Statement. "How many teachers desired but did not seek consultative assistance in each task area?"

The numbers of teachers who desired but did not seek consultative assistance are given in Table 53.

Only in four task areas did all teachers who desired consultation ask for assistance. These were "Operating audio-visual equipment," "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Obtaining student background information," and "Solving teacher-pupil problems." In some areas as many as seven teachers did not seek assistance. This was especially so in instructional task areas.

Table 53

Number of Teachers in Each Task Area Who Desired But Did Not Seek Consultative Assistance

TASK AREA No. Description	No.	Total Number of Teachers Indicating Task Area
CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM		
1. Developing course outlines	2	44
2. Selecting instructional materials	7	58
3. Developing unit/lesson plans	4	38
4. Developing instructional materials	3	38
5. Evaluating lessons/units	7	22
6. Interpreting curriculum guides	1	13
INSTRUCTIONAL		
7. Developing questioning techniques	5	11
8. Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	5	28
9. Planning role-playing	6	12
10. Developing/using small group activities	5	28
11. Planning individualized instruction	6	37
12. Using problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method	5	11
13. Leading discussions	7	9
14. Grouping for instruction	1	28
AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY		
15. Operating audio-visual equipment	0	51
16. Using kits, charts, games, simulations	2	28
17. Developing own audio-visual materials	4	18
SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS		
18. Diagnosis of learning difficulties	0	68
19. Developing remedial programs	2	60
20. Obtaining student-background information	0	43
21. Solving teacher-pupil problems	0	41
Total No. of Teachers	27	80

In "Developing questioning techniques," and in "Using the problem-solving/inquiry/discovery method," 5 of the 11 teachers desiring assistance in each area did not talk to anyone. In "Leading discussions" the numbers were even higher; 7 of 9 teachers did not seek assistance.

Teachers seemed most motivated to seek assistance in the special student needs task areas where in three of the four areas all teachers who so desired asked for assistance.

In all, 27 teachers had concerns for which they did not seek assistance. When these teachers were compared with their colleagues, no statistically significant differences were disclosed on any of the background variables.

Sub-Problem 6.2

Statement. "What reasons for their inaction were given by teachers who desired but did not seek assistance?"

In all, teachers indicated 13 reasons for not seeking assistance as given in Table 54. These fell into three main categories; those where the concern was not a crucial one but was one where the teacher would like more information; those where the teacher either had no time, no materials, no one to ask, or did not know whom to ask; and those where the information became available without seeking assistance.

Reasons stressing the concern as not crucial were given 24 times, where there was a lack of resources 52 times, and where the information became available 13 times. A lack of knowledge about whom

Table 54

Reasons Given by Teachers for Not Seeking Consultative Assistance

Reason	No. of Times Given
No one to ask or didn't know	18
General concern	3
Personal desire	9
COSTA workshop provided answers	5
Discussed at staff meetings	3
Discussed generally	4
Materials not available	1
No time	12
Not high priority/major concern	12
Didn't want to take up teacher's time	11
Asked husband	1
Needed help in making materials	1
No one else teaching program	9

to ask for assistance was given eighteen times as a reason for not obtaining assistance.

PROBLEM 7

This problem considered the overall pattern of consultation in the school and the extent of overlap with the general informal social network. The problem stated:

"What is the pattern of consultative assistance in each school?"

Sub-Problem 7.1

Statement. "What is the non-formal consultative network pattern for each school?"

In Tables 55 to 57, the matrices of staff interactions were manipulated so that teachers who taught the same grade level were grouped together on both axes. All interactions where a teacher indicated seeking assistance from a colleague were recorded in the appropriate column by a 1. For example, teacher 6 in School 1 indicated consulting teachers 19, 30, 38 and 23 but not teachers 13 and 37.

Teachers tended to seek assistance from other teachers of the same grade level, but this was more common for Division 1 teachers and especially for teachers of Grade 1.

School 1

There was extensive interaction among teachers in this school and differences in the interaction patterns of Division 1 and

Table 55

Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Assistance Examined by Grade Level Taught in School 1

	Grade Level Taught																																	
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1-2	2	2	2	2	Sp	M	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	GC	P	AP	6	6	Sp	L
Teacher Code No.	6	13	19	30	37	38	23	10	11	15	22	14	5	7	16	17	34	4	12	20	31	36	9	18	26	27	29	32	33	25	24	28	35	8
6	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
13	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
30	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
37	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
38	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
23	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	[illegible]	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1
36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	[illegible]	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1
8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0

Code for Grade Level Taught:
P = Principal; AP = Assistant Principal; GC = Guidance Counsellor; L = Librarian; Sp = Special Class; M = Music

Code for Matrix: 0 = no interaction; 1 = interaction

Table 56

Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Assistance Examined by Grade Level Taught in School 2

Grade Level Taught	1	1	1	1	2	2	2-3	3	3	Sp	AP	4	4	4-5	5	5	5	6	6	6	GC	P	L	M
Teacher Code No.	5	15	23	27	6	10	22	8	11	7	9	24	25	16	13	18	20	12	14	21	19	4	26	17
5	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
15	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
23	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
27	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
22	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
13	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0

Code for Grade Level Taught:
P = Principal; AP = Assistant Principal; GC = Guidance Counsellor; L = Librarian; Sp = Special Class; M = Music

Code for Matrix: 0 = no interaction; 1 = interaction

Table 57

Personnel from Whom Teachers Sought Assistance Examined by Grade Level Taught in School 3

	Grade Level Taught																					
Teacher	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	Sp	4	4	4	4	5	5	AP	P	L	M
Code No.	5	11	13	15	4	7	25	6	19	20	22	18	8	10	14	16	21	24	9	23	12	17
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
11	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
15	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
7	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
25	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
6	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0
19	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0
20	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Code for Grade Level Taught:
P = Principal; AP = Assistant Principal; L = Librarian; Sp = Special Class; M = Music

Code for Matrix: 0 = no interaction; 1 = interaction

Division 2 teachers were evident.

Division 1. Teachers in Grade 1 consulted each other almost exclusively. The principal, assistant principal, guidance counsellor and librarian were also consulted. Teacher 6 had more contacts throughout the staff but they did not indicate asking her for assistance. Teacher 23 taught a Grade 1-2 split class and hence also consulted with most Grade 2 teachers.

Grade 2 teachers also tended to consult only each other and the staff members holding formal positions in the school.

Teachers in Grade 3 consulted almost as often with teachers in Grade 2 and 4 as they did with each other.

Division 2. Grade 4 teachers consulted mainly among themselves and to some extent with Grade 5 teachers. Teacher 35 who taught Music and a Special class, and hence had pupils from most classes in Division 2, was consulted by teachers regardless of grade level.

Only some of the teachers in Grade 5 consulted each other. The guidance counsellor and the principal did not consult their fellow teachers but also only taught part-time. The teachers who did consult together also asked most of the Grade 6 teachers for assistance.

For Grade 6 teachers, most of their assistance came from teachers in Grade 5 and to a lesser extent from each other.

School 2

The level of consultation was much lower for School 2 than for School 1. While Grade 1 teachers again tended to cluster exclusively, teachers in other grade levels did not show as clear an interaction pattern.

Division 1. Grade 1 teachers consulted each other and also the staff in formal positions. Grade 2 teachers consulted teacher 7 who taught remedial reading to students from all classes in the school, rather than each other. Teacher 22 who taught a Grade 2-3 split class consulted extensively with teachers in Grades 1, 2 and 3 and teacher 7.

Grade 3 teachers had few consultative interactions.

Division 2. Few teachers in Grade 4 consulted each other when teacher 7, the remedial reading specialist, and teacher 9, the assistant principal, are discounted. They did consult with teacher 13 who taught Grade 5 and was in charge of the science fair organization.

Grade 5 teachers discussed their concerns more often with Grade 4 and Grade 6 teachers than with each other.

Teachers in Grade 6 consulted each other and teacher 7.

Staff in formal positions were consulted by most teachers regardless of grade level taught.

School 3

The teachers in this school had been together as a staff for a longer period of time than staffs in the other schools, hence the pattern of interaction was somewhat different.

Division 1. Teachers in Grade 1 consulted not only each other but also teacher 20, a Grade 3 teacher who was knowledgeable about audio-visual equipment. Teacher 15 also consulted teachers in Grade 2.

Grade 2 teachers consulted each other, most Grade 3 teachers and some Grade 4 teachers.

Teachers in Grade 3 consulted fellow teachers teaching in their own grade level, teachers in Grade 2 and some Grade 4 teachers.

Division 2. Teachers in Grade 4 also consulted teachers in Grades 3 and 5.

Grade 5 teachers similarly asked for assistance from teachers in Grades 3 and 4 as well as from each other.

As in Schools 1 and 2, teachers holding formal positions in the school were consulted by most teachers regardless of grade level taught.

Sub-Problem 7.2

Statement. "To what extent does the non-formal consultative network overlap the informal socialization network in each school?"

The extent of congruence between the consultative and informal networks is given in Table 58.

School 1

Forty-four percent of choices in the informal network were also consultation choices, representing 98 mutual choices where

Table 58

Percentage Comparisons of Friendship Choices in the Informal Socialization Network and Interactions in the Non-Formal Consultation Network, for Each School

(a) Informal Socialization Network of Friendship Choices

Teacher Named as Consultant	School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes	43.8	45.3	45.5
No	56.2	54.7	54.5
N	224	106	121
	100.0	100.0	100.0

(b) Non-Formal Consultation Network of Interactions Where Teachers Indicated Receiving Consultative Assistance

Teacher was Friendship Choice	School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes	39.7	36.6	39.3
No	60.3	63.4	60.7
N	247	131	140
	100.0	100.0	100.0

teachers chose as friends those persons with whom they consulted.

Of the 247 interactions where teachers were named as consultants, in 40 percent the teacher was also chosen as a friend, but in 60 percent of consultations this was not the case.

School 2

There were 106 choices in the informal network and 131 in the non-formal consultation network. Forty-five percent of the socialization choices were also consultation choices. Of the 131 consultations, 37 percent were also socialization choices, but 63 percent were consultation choices only. There were 46 interactions in School 2 where teachers consulted friends.

School 3

Of the 121 socialization choices, 55 (46 percent) were also consultation choices. Thirty-nine percent of teachers who were chosen as consultants were also nominated as friends but 61 percent were not indicated on the socialization network.

Approximately 64 percent of interactions were not listed in describing assistance received in the twenty-one task areas. However, in obtaining the data, many teachers were able to list the specific concerns for which they had provided consultative assistance. This suggested that teachers in listing the personnel whom they consulted either forgot that specific interaction or did not perceive it as a search for assistance. The extent of congruence between a combined network of interactions where teachers indicated providing assistance and those where teachers were named as consultants and the informal network was also examined. The data are given in Table 59.

Table 59

Percentage Comparisons of Friendship Choices in the Informal Socialization Network and Interactions in the Total Consultation Network, for Each School

(a) Informal Socialization Network of Friendship Choices

Teacher Indicated Giving or Receiving Consultative Assistance		School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes		64.3	69.8	77.7
No		35.7	30.2	22.3
	N	224 100.0	106 100.0	121 100.0

(b) Total Consultation Network of Interactions Where Teachers Indicated Either Giving or Receiving Consultative Assistance

Teacher was Friendship Choice		School 1 %	School 2 %	School 3 %
Yes		35.1	27.5	35.6
No		64.9	72.5	64.4
	N	405 100.0	269 100.0	264 100.0

School 1

Sixty-three percent of the choices in the informal social interaction network were also choices in the general consultation network. Of the 405 choices in the general consultation network, 35 percent were also socialization choices and 65 percent were not.

School 2

There were 106 choices in the informal network and 269 choices in the general consultation network. Of the 269 choices, 28 percent were also socialization choices. Hence, there were 74 choices where teachers consulted with friends but 227 choices where this was not the case.

School 3

There were 121 choices in the socialization network and 267 in the consultation network. In all, there were 94 congruent choices, accounting for 78 percent of the socialization network and 35 percent of the general consultation network.

In School 3 with the smallest staff size, the extent of overlap between the socialization and consultation networks was the greatest (78 percent), and in School 1 the least with an overlap of 63 percent. Teachers in School 1 consulted more often with peers who were not socialization choices than did teachers in Schools 2 and 3.

SUMMARY

This chapter presented teachers' responses regarding their choice of consultants, their own provision of consultation, their satisfaction with the consultation which they received and their reasons for not seeking assistance. The general pattern of consultative assistance and the extent of overlap with the socialization network in each school was also discussed.

In general, teachers consulted with eight other staff members, the majority of whom taught in the same grade level. For all three schools, the persons consulted most often were the principals, assistant principals, guidance counsellors, librarians, remedial reading teachers and five classroom teachers. They differed from their colleagues in the high proportion of males in their numbers, and their number of years of post-secondary education.

Teachers indicated providing consultative assistance for approximately eight colleagues with personnel in formal positions indicating the widest consultation nets. Two teachers in School 2 did not provide consultation for anyone.

The congruence between the teachers named as consultants and the personnel for whom teachers indicated providing consultative assistance was low. It ranged between 32 and 40 percent, suggesting that teachers did not view many interactions as seeking assistance, the topics discussed were not specifically listed as task areas, teachers provided a list of the persons consulted on some but not all occasions in any one recurring task area or simply that teachers forgot about the interaction.

Sixty-two percent of teachers indicated that they provided consultative assistance "at least twice a week" and 17 percent felt that they were asked "Infrequently" for assistance.

Overall, teachers were satisfied with the consultative assistance which they received. The percentage of interactions that were "Not Very Satisfactory" varied from zero to 33 percent in different task areas. Satisfactory information about instructional-task areas was the most difficult to obtain.

Teachers' satisfaction with the information which they received tended to decrease with increasing years of post-secondary education, with total years of teaching experience, if they held a formal staff position other than classroom teacher and if they taught in Division 2. Teachers in School 1 were more satisfied than were other teachers in their consultative assistance while School 3 teachers were more dissatisfied.

In all but four task areas, some teachers desired but did not seek consultative assistance. Twenty-seven teachers had concerns but did not seek consultation. They did not seek assistance because the concern was not crucial but the teacher would have liked more information, the teacher had no resources of time, material or personnel, or the teacher obtained the information without asking for assistance.

Teachers tended to seek assistance from two groups, persons in formal positions in the school and colleagues teaching in the same grade level.

Approximately 45 percent of socialization choices were also consultation choices. When both dimensions of the provision of consultation are included in the consultation network, the percentage of mutual choices rose to 64 to 77 percent, indicating that teachers tended to seek friendships among teachers teaching at the same level as well as seeking assistance from these colleagues.

Chapter 8

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

A summary of the study, including a restatement of the problems, the research methodology used and a review of the major findings is presented in the first section of this chapter. In section 2, conclusions drawn from the data and implications of the findings for educational administrators are discussed.

SUMMARY

Restatement of the Problems

This study examined teachers' consultative needs, and in particular, considered the following problems:

1. What were teachers' consultative needs?
2. Whom did teachers consult?
3. Did teachers perceive themselves as consultants?
4. Were teachers satisfied with the information which they received?
5. Did teachers desire but not seek assistance? and
6. What was the pattern of consultative assistance in each school?

These major problems were each divided into a number of sub-problems.

Research Methodology

An introductory questionnaire and follow-up interview were used to obtain the data for the study. The population was the staffs of three elementary schools in an Alberta school system. All eighty teachers in the population participated in the study. Percentage frequency distributions and matrices were used to categorize the data. The distribution of responses by selected background variables was also obtained.

Review of the Findings

The findings are discussed under the major problem categories.

Problem 1. "In which task areas did teachers desire consultative assistance?"

Over 50 percent of teachers desired assistance in seven task areas. These were "Developing course outlines" (55 percent), "Selecting instructional materials" (73 percent), "Operating audio-visual equipment" (63 percent), and all four task areas in the Special Student Needs section.

The greatest percentage of teachers desiring assistance in "Developing course outlines" were those with more than 2 years of post-secondary education, those with less than seven years of teaching experience, and those in their first two years with the school system and the school.

In "Selecting instructional materials," the greatest percentage of teachers desiring assistance was teachers with one to three years of post-secondary education, those with less than ten years of teaching experience, teachers in their first year of employment in the school system and the school, classroom teachers and those in Division 2.

Beginning teachers, Division 2 teachers, those with least years of post-secondary education and teachers who had been employed in the school system and in their present school for less than two years most often indicated desiring assistance in "Operating audio-visual equipment."

In all Special Student Needs task areas, the highest percentage of teachers desiring assistance was classroom teachers, Division 1 teachers, those with less than three years of post-secondary education and teachers with seven to ten years of teaching experience.

The concerns most frequently indicated by teachers were "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Development of remedial programs," and "Selecting instructional materials." These were ranked as the three most important concerns regardless of any background variable.

In all task areas except "Interpreting curriculum guides" the majority of concerns recurred over the September to February period. This was particularly evident in "Developing instructional materials," "Evaluating lessons/units," "Developing questioning techniques," "Obtaining student-background information," and "Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations."

Teachers in Division 2, and those who had more than six years of teaching experience most frequently indicated all their concerns as recurring.

The most important concerns during September-October were "Interpreting curriculum guides," "Developing course outlines," "Grouping for instruction," and "Selecting instructional materials," concerns ranked first or second for most teachers regardless of categorization by background variables.

Teachers with increasing years of teacher experience and Division 2 teachers were the most specific in their selection of task area concerns in September-October, with higher percentages of concerns in fewer task areas.

Division 1 teachers were very concerned about "Interpreting curriculum guides" and all task areas in the Special Student Needs section, while Division 2 teachers stressed "Planning individualized instruction" and "Grouping for instruction" at the beginning of the school year.

Problem 2. "What were the specific concerns of teachers in each of the task areas?"

Teachers sought to discuss and share ideas about students, materials and teaching techniques, to obtain information on specific teaching strategies, to supplement their knowledge of subject matter and concepts and to obtain assistance in the diagnosis of student learning difficulties and the development of strategies to remedy them.

In "Developing course outlines" concerns about concepts and subject matter were most often expressed by beginning teachers, Division 2 teachers, those with less than three years of post-secondary education, and teachers new to their present school. Division 1 teachers, those with more than four years of post-secondary education, and those who had been teaching in their present school for at least two years were more concerned about exchanging and discussing ideas.

In "Selecting instructional materials" knowing what materials were available was most often a concern of teachers with one to two years of post-secondary education, and those in their first year of employment in the school, while teachers with four or more years of post-secondary education, and those with seven to ten years of teaching experience were more interested in obtaining assistance in selecting materials to teach concepts.

Teachers in all categories except those with four to six years of teaching experience and those who had taught in the school for three to ten years were most interested in the operation of audio-visual equipment.

In "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Development of remedial programs," and "Solving teacher-pupil problems," teachers' concerns were subsumed in the title of the task area. In "Obtaining student-background information," Division 1 teachers, those with less than seven years of teaching experience and those new to the school asked for assistance in obtaining information not available on school records related to the family background of the student, while teachers with seven or more years of teaching experience tended to seek information about students' progress from other teachers and cumulative record cards.

Problem 3. "Whom did teachers ask for assistance?"

Teachers consulted, on average, eight other staff members, usually colleagues teaching at their own grade level and staff in formal positions in the school.

Hence, the persons consulted most often overall were the staffs in formal positions, remedial reading specialists, and five regular classroom teachers.

These persons besides holding formal positions were more often male, and with five to six years of post-secondary education.

Problem 4. "Did teachers view themselves as providing consultative assistance to others?"

On average, teachers indicated providing assistance for eight peers. However, the extent of congruence between teachers named as consultants and teachers' perceptions of themselves as consultants ranged from 32 to 40 percent.

The perceived frequency of consultation was quite intensive with 62 percent of teachers indicating that they provided consultative assistance "at least twice a week."

Problem 5. "Were teachers satisfied with the consultative assistance which they obtained?"

In general, teachers were able to obtain satisfactory assistance with 44 percent of all interactions being rated "Very Satisfactory" and a further 48 percent rated "Satisfactory."

Teachers' dissatisfaction with the consultative assistance which they received increased with years of post-secondary education and years of teaching experience. Other position holders and Division 2 teachers were also more likely to be dissatisfied with the consultative assistance they received.

School 1 teachers were the most satisfied and School 3 teachers the most dissatisfied with their consultative assistance.

Problem 6. "Did teachers desire but not seek consultative assistance?"

Only in four task areas did all teachers who desired consultation seek assistance. Twenty-seven teachers had concerns but did not seek assistance for the following reasons: they did not consider it to be a crucial concern, did not know whom to ask, had no time or materials, or they obtained the information without seeking assistance.

Problem 7. "What was the pattern of consultative assistance in each school?"

For 45 percent of interactions in each school where teachers were named as consultants, these consultants were also friendship choices. When interactions where teachers indicated providing consultative assistance were included, the percentage of friendship choices ranged from 64 to 77 percent.

In general, teachers consulted with staff in formal positions, specialists, and with colleagues teaching the same grade level but the consultation pattern varied for each school.

In School 1, teachers in Grades 1 and 2 consulted almost entirely within their own grade levels, while teachers in other grades consulted not only with each other but also with colleagues in the grades above and below their own. Grades 5 and 6 teachers consulted more with each other across grades than within grades.

In School 2, teachers in Grade 1 consulted each other quite extensively but this pattern was not as evident for teachers in any other grade. In Grades 2, 3, and 4, teachers had few consultative concerns. Where teachers did consult with colleagues they tended to choose teachers teaching the same grade level or those teaching the grade above or below their own.

In School 3, teachers more often spread their choice of consultants across grade levels than in Schools 1 and 2. Teachers in most grade levels consulted not only with each other but also with colleagues teaching in the grade levels above and below their own. In this school with five grade levels, teachers in Grade 3 were frequently consultants for teachers in all grades, including Grade 1.

While each of the three schools differed in its administrative organization and formal consultative network, there were not statistically significant differences in the percentages of teachers indicating each task area when examined by school. This would suggest that the findings might have more general applicability that was expected.

Relevance of the Findings to the Literature on Consultation

In an attempt to determine the contribution of the study to theory in consultation, specific findings of the study are discussed in relation to the general literature on consultation which was reviewed in Chapter 2.

At present the most strongly advocated approach to consultation in the literature is that of individual professional growth. This 'growth' approach to consultation where teachers delineate their problems and choose the means and ends for their professional growth was the approach used by the principals of the three schools in the study.

The use of a definition of consultation as "an exchange of advice and/or assistance between the classroom teacher and other personnel in the educational setting where the exchange was initiated by the classroom teacher," permitted the description of a much more extensive pattern of consultative assistance than would have been possible with a definition which limited consultation to those interactions which included the principal or assistant principal.

Teacher-peer assistance. Previous research has indicated that teachers consider colleagues to be a major source of consultative assistance and in the three schools in this study this was certainly the case. While some teachers, especially those in Division 2, consulted colleagues at different grade levels, in general, teachers tended to seek assistance from their peers who were teaching at the same grade level. Within this group, preferences in teaching style, proximity of classrooms and individual personalities may have dictated to some extent the choice of consultant.

Sergiovanni (1971:3) stressed the need for supervisors "to generate leadership among those who work in the school" rather than working to provide direct leadership for them. Although an extensive network of consultative assistance was evident in each school, the paucity of non-formal leaders was obvious when personnel holding positions other than classroom teacher were excluded from the analysis. This would suggest that the provision of opportunities for teachers to interact and work together is not sufficient, by itself, to generate leaders among the teaching staff.

Teacher-central office personnel assistance. The amount and worth of assistance provided by central office personnel has been an ambiguous one despite research studies in this area. In this study, central office personnel were consulted frequently and their consultative assistance rated "Satisfactory" or "Very Satisfactory." Teachers mentioned obtaining assistance from the Assistant Superintendent, and to a lesser extent, from the Director of Guidance. The Assistant Superintendent, who was a primary reading specialist was consulted on 61 occasions in School 1, 36 occasions in School 2, and on 17 occasions in School 3. The Director of Guidance provided consultative assistance on 7 occasions in School 1, 11 occasions in School 2, and on 21 occasions in School 3.

Teacher-principal assistance. Previous research studies (Wetter, 1965; Young, 1967) have concluded that teachers preferred principals who readily provided consultative assistance. The perception of the principal as a primary reference source for teachers is also evident from the findings of this study.

Principals were consulted in almost all task areas, and especially those in curriculum and program, and special students needs. In curriculum and program task areas, "Developing course outlines" and "Selecting instructional materials" were the task areas where the principal's advice was most often sought. In special student needs task areas most consultation took place about "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Obtaining student-background information."

Identification of teachers' consultative needs. Previous research in this area, which has been confined to the problems of beginning teachers, has indicated that teachers' consultative concerns are most predominant in the area of student needs. In this study which examined the concerns of teachers of varying years of teaching experience, the area of student needs has also received major emphasis. Over 50 percent of teachers sought assistance in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties," "Developing remedial programs," "Obtaining student-background information," and "Solving teacher-pupil problems."

Of the six task areas listed in the curriculum and program section, at least 48 percent of teachers desired assistance in all but two task areas. They wanted assistance in planning their courses, selecting appropriate instructional materials, and in operating audio-visual equipment, and these concerns occurred throughout the September-February period.

The instructional methodology task areas which traditionally have received most emphasis in in-service programs were not areas of concern to many teachers. In those task areas in which at least 35 percent of teachers desired assistance, their specific concerns were related to diagnosis of student needs as, for example, in "Planning individualized instruction."

Introductory study by Plamondon. Using the same school system, Plamondon (1973) surveyed all teachers and asked them to indicate the areas in which they would like to have consultative assistance available on request. He found that over 80 percent of teachers would like to have consultative assistance available in the general area of student needs and over 60 percent in curriculum and methodology areas. The findings of this study show a similar distribution of teacher concerns and confirm that teachers' choices in the Plamondon study reflect their day-to-day concerns.

Teachers in the 1973 study were also asked to indicate the personnel whom they felt could best provide this consultative assistance. They chose in-school personnel as first choice in all task areas, choosing guidance personnel as their best source of assistance in the area of student needs, department heads in curriculum and program development, and other teachers in instructional methodology.

These results are again replicated in the present study. Resource teachers and guidance personnel were the major sources of assistance used in this most recent study while principals and assistant principals as well as colleagues were consulted in the areas of curriculum and program development and instructional methodology. Their earlier choices in the Plamondon study may reflect their satisfaction with the present consultative network.

While 74 percent of teachers in the introductory study were in favor of giving teachers of recognized ability with no administrative position, release time on a scheduled basis to provide consultative assistance, these teacher-consultants were not immediately evident from the most recent study.

These findings in the study suggest certain conclusions about teacher-peer interactions and the specific concerns of teachers and have implications for the role of the principal as consultant and the organizational arrangements necessary to facilitate consultation.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

There was extensive teacher-peer interaction for consultative assistance in all schools but most often in School 1 where teachers teaching the same grade level had a preparation period together once in six days. In School 3, where the monthly grade meeting also included discussion of matters referred to it from the general staff meeting, opportunities for teacher-peer interaction were reduced.

The frequency of teacher interactions and teachers' specific concerns for discussing and exchanging ideas, planning cooperatively and sharing materials, suggests that administrators should make timetable arrangements so that teachers might have ample opportunity to share their concerns on a regular basis.

Administrators might encourage teachers to discuss their concerns and choose areas of particular interest to them. For example, the teachers in this study might have chosen to discuss the concepts essential to that grade level, useful instructional materials and possible teaching strategies. Having identified their needs, teachers would then decide how and from whom to obtain consultative assistance. These teacher-initiated in-service sessions allow teachers the opportunity to fulfil their own needs.

The stress here is on the administrator encouraging staff to grow and develop in areas of interest to them rather than on providing answers to queries or deciding what in-service sessions should be organized.

The intensity of consultations at the beginning of the school year especially for assistance in "Developing course outlines," "Selecting instructional materials," "Interpreting curriculum guides," and "Grouping for instruction" indicates that administrators might well alleviate some anxieties by organizing opportunities for teacher interaction and for small explanatory sessions where teachers who had previously taught the subject, grade level or class might share their experiences, outline what concepts were essential and list available materials for their colleagues.

Such meetings would be of particular importance to teachers new to the school who do not know what knowledge and skill development was taught in the students' previous grade level or what level of competence and depth of knowledge to demand from their students.

Principals, assistant principals and guidance counsellors might also organize their time, especially during the September-October period to be readily available for teacher consultation. A supportive administrator who encourages interaction rather than waiting for teacher-initiated consultation could do much to enhance teacher morale during this critical period.

Principals should also pay particular attention to the concerns of beginning teachers. Two beginning teachers in this study frequently listed as their reasons for not obtaining assistance, a lack of knowledge about whom to ask, and a fear of overburdening their more experienced fellow grade teachers by asking too many questions.

The concerns about "Interpreting curriculum guides" mentioned by thirteen teachers and the general dissatisfaction with the consultative assistance received suggests that administrators might be better prepared either in awareness of whom teachers might consult, or in interpretation of the guides. Since administrators distributed the guides at the beginning of the year and discussed their contents, they are the focii of this problem.

As indicated by previous research studies (Ellis, 1974; Moller, 1968), the Special Student Needs task areas were the most intensively indicated by most teachers all of whom sought assistance. The pressure for consultations in "Diagnosis of learning difficulties" and "Development of remedial programs" might be alleviated somewhat by hiring a diagnostic specialist, making sure guidance counsellors and remedial reading specialists have adequate time and opportunity for teacher consultation, and encouraging staff growth in these areas.

Administrative arrangements for the availability and maintenance of audio-visual equipment have obviously an impact on teacher concerns. A competent person is essential to demonstrate the operation of audio-visual equipment and to handle maintenance problems is essential.

This study has documented that teacher-peer interactions for consultative assistance are an important facet of school organization, that teachers have specific concerns, that teachers tend to consult with staff in formal positions, with friends and with fellow grade teachers, that teachers tend to consult, on average, eight other persons, and that they are generally satisfied with the information which they receive. These findings have implications for the administration of schools and the supervision of teachers. They also suggest avenues for future research.

Suggested Research Studies

This study had as its population the staffs of three elementary schools in one small school system. Other studies might examine the consultative networks in other elementary schools, in junior and senior high schools, in schools in other types of jurisdictions and in other provinces.

Studies might focus on the task areas and specific concerns of teachers and examine the responses of a large sample of the province's teachers at elementary and secondary levels, or narrow in on specific teachers, for example, beginning teachers, and try to examine more precisely their specific concerns.

The identification of personnel providing consultation might also furnish an area for future research. Studies might examine teachers who are most often consulted to discover whether they retain their position over time, if they lose their position, or if they maintain their position but change clientele when their teaching assignment changes, and whether they are also influential in general school matters.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Andrews, J.H.M.
1960 "Who Shall Supervise?" Paper presented at the C.E.A. Short Course, Banff, Alberta.

Babin, Patrick
1972 "The Supervisor's Role in Individualizing Instruction," The Educational Courier, 42:18-21.

Bales, Robert F.
1950 "A Set of Categories For the Analysis of Small Group Interaction," American Sociological Review, 15:257-263.

Bales, Robert F. and Phillip E. Slater
1955 "Role Differentiation in Small Decision-making Groups," in Parsons and Bales, Family Socialization, and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press.

Berner, M.K.
1957 "Development of the Procedures and Techniques for the Analysis of the Relationships between the Formal Organization of High School Systems and the Informal Communication Structures within These Systems." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Bezeau, Laurence
1966 "The Instrumental-Expressive Dichotomy in School Staffs." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta

Blowers, T.A.
1972 "Personnel Utilization in Elementary and Secondary Education in Alberta." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Boyan, Norman John
1951 "A Study of the Formal and Informal Organization of a School Faculty." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

Breitkreuz, Elmer A.
1967 "An Analysis of School Influence and Sub-group Structures." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Carr, Rex A.
1974 "The Original Orientation of Teachers and Change in Elementary and Secondary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Des Moines: University of Iowa.

Charters, W.W. Jr.
1969 "Stability and Change in the Communication Structure of School Facilities," Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn: 15-38.

Corey, Stephen M.
1963 "A More Wholesome Balance," Educational Leadership, 21(2): 67.

Dubin, Robert
1961 The World of Work. Englewood Cliffs, N.W.: Prentice-Hall.

Ellis, G.B.
1974 "Determination and Testing of a Needs Assessment Technique for Harvesting the Educational Needs of Professionals." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Salt Lake City: University of Utah.

Enns, Frederick
1968 "Supervision of Instruction: A Conceptual Framework," Canadian Education and Research Digest, Sept.: 283-297.

Farrell, Mary E.
1969 "The Identification and Evaluation of Professional Problems of Elementary Teachers in an Urban Area as a Basis for the Improvement of Supervision and In-service Training." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.

Fuller, F.F.
1969 "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization," American Educational Research Journal, 6:207-226.

Fuller, F.F. and J.S. Parsons
1972 "Current Research on the Concerns of Teachers." Austin: Research and Development Centre for Teacher Education, Texas University.

Franc, L.H.
1970 "Problems Perceived by Seventy-Five Beginning Elementary School Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: Columbia University.

Gardner, Robert Myles
1971 "Curriculum Planning Needs of Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Buffalo, N.Y.: State University of New York.

Greenberger, E. and A. Sorensen
1969 "A Sociometric Study of a Junior High School Staff." Research project No. 56. Baltimore, Maryland: Centre for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, The John Hopkins University.

Greenfield, T.B.
1974 "Theory in The Study of Organizations and Administrative Structures: A New Perspective." Paper presented at the third International Intervisitation Programme, Bristol, England.

Harnack, Robert S.
1968 The Teacher: Decision Maker and Curriculum Planner. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook.

Harris, Ben M.
1968 Supervisory Behavior in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Harrison, R.E.
1965 "An Analysis of the Weekly Workload of Nova Scotia High School Principals." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Haughey, Margaret L.
1972 "Opinions of Teachers in Alberta Concerning Staffing Practices." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Heck, Shirley F.
1972 "Teacher-Peer Interactions." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Madison: University of Wisconsin.

Herzberg, F., B. Mausner, and B. Snyderman
1959 The Motivation to Work. New York: Wiley.

Holdaway, E.A.
1971 "Research Into Consultation." Paper presented at C.E.A. Short Course on Educational Leadership, Banff. Alberta.

House, John H.
1966 "An Analysis of Interpersonal Influence Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Hrynyk, Nicholas P.
1966 "Correlates of Professional Role Orientation in Teaching." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Iannaconne, Laurence
1958 "The Social System of a School Staff." Unpublished Ed. D. project, Teachers College, Columbia University reported in D.E. Griffiths et. al. Organizing Schools for Effective Instruction. Danville, Ill.: Interstate.

Jackson, Philip W.
1971 "Old Dogs and New Tricks: Observations on the Continuing Education of Teachers," in L. Rubin (ed.) Improving Inservice Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

James, J.
1959 "A Preliminary Study of the Size Determinant in Small Group Interaction," American Sociological Review, 16:474-477.

Kass, Heidi
1975 "A Concern-Based Developmental Sequence of Teacher Professional Growth." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education, Edmonton, Alberta.

Lippett, Ronald et. al
1967 "The Teacher as Innovator, Seeker, and Shower of New Practices," in R.I. Miller (ed.) Perspectives in Educational Change. New York: Meridith.

Lucio, William H.
1967 "The Supervisory Function: Overview, Analysis, Propositions," in Supervision: Perspectives and Propositions. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

Lucio, W.H. and J.D. McNeil
1969 Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill. (revised edition).

McCleary, L.E.
1957 A Study of Interpersonal Influence Within a School Staff." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Urbana: University of Illinois.

MacDonald, James B.
1966 "Helping Teachers Change," in J. Rath and R.B. Leeper (eds.) The Supervisor: Agent for Change in Teaching. Washington, D.C.: ASCD.

McGillivray, William R.
1966 "A Survey of Supervisory Assistance as Perceived by Beginning Teachers in Selected Urban High Schools in Ontario." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

MacKay, D.A.
1971 "A Systematic Approach to Consultation," Paper presented at the C.E.A. Short Course on Educational Leadership, Banff, Alberta.

1969 "Canadian Supervisory Practices," The Canadian Administrator, 9:10-14.

McLoughlin, Roy I.
1965 "A Study of the Role of the Supervisor of Elementary Instruction." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Maslow, Abraham H.
1943 "A Theory of Human Motivation," The Psychological Review, 50:370-396.

Miklos, Erwin
1971 "Alternative Approaches to Supervision and Consultation." Paper presented at the CEA Short Course on Educational Leadership, Banff, Alberta.

1968 "The Analysis of Influence and Social Structure in Schools." Paper presented at the AERA Annual Meeting. St. Louis, Miss.

Miles, Matthew
1965 "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in R. Carlson et. al. Change Processes in the Public Schools. Eugene, Oregon: CASEA.

Milne, John L.
1968 "Problems of First Year Teachers in the Urban School System." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Moffit, John C.
1967 In-Service Education for Teachers. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education Inc.

Moller, G.E.
1968 "A Comprehensive Study of the Problems of Beginning Teachers in Selected Large Senior High Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Omaha: University of Nebraska.

Morin, L.H.
1964 "The Principal's Perception of His Role." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Oberg, Antoinette A.
1975 "Information Referents and Patterns in the Curriculum Planning of Classroom Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Parsons, G.L.
1972 "Stages in the Evolution of Educational Supervision," NTA Journal, 63:30-35.

1971 "Teacher Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness," The Canadian Administrator, 11:5-8.

Pettibone, Timothy J.
1969 "An Analysis of the Elementary School Organization: Its Climate Dimensions and Structures of Interpersonal Relations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Albuquerque: New Mexico State University.

Pitsula, Michael
1966 "An Analysis of the Role of Supervisory Assistants in Large Administrative Units in Saskatchewan." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Plamondon, Jacques L.
1973 "Consultative Needs of Teachers." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Porter, Lyman
1963 "Job Attitudes in Management: I. Perceived Deficiencies in Need Fulfilment as a Function of Job Level," Journal of Applied Psychology, 47:386-397.

Ross, George E.
1960 "A Study of Informal Communication Patterns in Two Elementary Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Urbana: University of Illinois.

Rubin, Louis
1971 Improving In-Service Education: Proposals and Procedures for Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Rubin, Stephen E.
1965 "A Social Systems Analysis of the Informal Structure of a School Faculty: An Investigation of Sentiment-Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. New York: New York University.

Schneider, B. and C.P. Alderfer
1973 "Three Studies of Measures of Need Satisfactions in Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 18,4: 489-505.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J.
1971 "What Kinds of Objectives for Supervisors?" Paper presented at the Symposium of Cayahoga Instructional Supervision Study, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and F.D. Carver
1974 The New School Executive: A Theory of Administration. New York: Dodd Mead.

1971 "Complexity, Adaptibility, and Job Satisfaction: An Axiomatic Theory Applied," Journal of Educational Administration, IX (1): 10-31.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and R.J. Starratt
1971 Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Shorey, Leonard L.
1969 "Teacher Participation in Continuing Education Activities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Toronto: University of Toronto.

Slater, Philip E.
1961 "Role Differentation in Small Groups," in Hare, Borgatta, and Bales (ed.) Small Groups: Studies in Social Interaction. New York: Knopf.

Snelgrove, Vernon J.
1965 "A Study of the Administrative Role of the District Supervising Inspector in Newfoundland." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Staples, Brian
1970 "The Professional Development Needs of Practicing Alberta Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Missoula, Montana: University of Montana.

Stehno, Edward H.
1971 "The Relationship Between Formal and Informal Organizations of Three Kansas Secondary Schools." Unpublished Ed. D. thesis. Kansas City: University of Kansas.

Thomas, B.
1974 "A Comparative Analysis of the Informal Communication Structure of Four Junior High Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Seattle: University of Washington.

Tower, Melvin M.
1965 "A Study of Orientation and In-Service Education Practices in the Indianapolis Public Schools," in J.E. Heald et. al. (eds.) Selected Readings on General Supervision. New York: Macmillan.

Wetter, W.J.
1965 "The Role of the Elementary School Principal as Defined by Parents in Selected Attendance Areas." Unpublished Master's thesis. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Wilensky, Harold L.
1970 "The Professionalization of Everyone?" in O. Grusky and G.A. Miller (eds.) The Sociology of Organizations. New York: Free Press.

Wilhelms, Fred T.
1970 "The Delicate Art Called Supervision," Headmaster, Fall: 39-41.

Wilson, L.C. et. al.
1969 Sociology of Supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

~~Yarnall~~, G.G.
1970 "Communication Patterns Among Teachers in Team-Teaching Oriented Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Miami: University of Florida.

Young, J.E.M.
1967 "A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes Towards Certain Aspects of Their Profession," Canadian Education and Research Digest, June: 112-129.

APPENDIX

INSTRUMENTS USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

CONSULTATIVE TASK AREAS QUESTIONNAIRE

Your number _______ 1-2

The validity of the conclusions which can be drawn from the information obtained depends on the accuracy of your responses. Please base your answers on your experience and your perceptions of the situations.

PART 1

In answering the questions in this section, choose as few or as many names from the List of Personnel provided as you feel are necessary to reply fully.

Circle the number or numbers which correspond to your choices. If you cannot make any choices, circle NONE.

1. Indicate the individuals with whom you usually share moments of free time, for example, with whom you usually eat lunch and/or have coffee before or after school.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
   20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 NONE

2. Indicate the individuals with whom you associate socially outside of school time and on other than school sponsored occasions.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
   20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 NONE

3. Indicate the individuals with whom you have had any major disagreement over any matter.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19
   20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 NONE

PART 2

For each category in the list of consultative task areas, check (√) if you have desired assistance (whether or not you asked for it) in this area once during this school year. If you desired assistance more than once, check twice (√√).

CURRICULUM AND PROGRAM TASK AREAS

Developing course outlines	( )	3
Selecting instructional materials	( )	4
Developing unit or lesson plans	( )	5
Developing instructional materials	( )	6
Evaluating lessons or units	( )	7
Interpreting Department of Education curriculum guides	( )	8

INSTRUCTIONAL TASK AREAS

Developing questioning techniques	( )	9
Teaching concepts, constructs, generalizations	( )	10
Planning role-playing	( )	11
Developing or using small group activities	( )	12
Planning individualized instruction	( )	13
Using the problem-solving/discovery/inquiry method	( )	14
Leading discussions	( )	15
Grouping for instruction	( )	16

AUDIO-VISUAL TECHNOLOGY TASK AREAS

Operating audio-visual equipment (projectors, video-tape recorders, record players, etc.) ( ) 17

Using kits, charts, games, simulations ( ) 18

Developing your own audio-visual materials ( ) 19

SPECIAL STUDENT NEEDS TASK AREAS

Diagnosing of learning difficulties ( ) 20

Developing remedial programs ( ) 21

Obtaining student background information ( ) 22

Solving teacher-pupil problems ( ) 23

Add any other areas in which you have desired assistance and check accordingly.

.... ( ) 24

.... ( ) 25

.... ( ) 26

.... ( ) 27

.... ( ) 28

PART 3

In order to organize the information obtained in these questionnaires, it is necessary to have some personal data about the respondents.

Would you please check (✓) where appropriate.

1. Sex: 1. ( ) Female 2. ( ) Male 29

2. Number of Complete Years of Post-Secondary Education
(as assessed for salary purposes)

( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6 or more years 30

3. Number of Years of Teaching Experience
(include the current year as a full year)

(a) Total number ( ) 31-32

(b) In St. Albert P.S.S.D. ( ) 33-34

(c) In your present school ( ) 35-36

4. Is your teaching assignment generally consistent with your academic preparation?

Yes ( ) 1. No ( ) 2. 37

5. Grade level taught:

( ) 1 ( ) 2 ( ) 3 ( ) 4 ( ) 5 ( ) 6

( ) 1-2 ( ) 2-3 ( ) 4-5

Music, Remedial Reading, Library, Guidance, Special Class ( ) 38

6. Position in your present school:

1. ( ) Classroom teacher
2. ( ) Principal
3. ( ) Assistant Principal
4. ( ) Librarian
5. ( ) Counsellor
6. ( ) Grade Conference Chairman 39
7. ( ) Resource teacher
8. ( ) Teacher aide (P.E.P.)

Your school number ________ 40

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Said by Interviewer to Interviewee:

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. As you know this interview is to provide information about the specific consultative needs of teachers and the persons whom they consult for this assistance.

The interview will be kept confidential.

Today I'd like to talk about your consultative concerns. For the purposes of this study, consultation is viewed as assistance asked for by the teacher in order to aid and support the teaching process in the classroom.

I would like to go over each of the consultative task areas you indicated on the questionnaire so that I can get a better idea of the specific consultative concerns you had.

(The following format is repeated for each of the task areas specified.)

A. Would you describe what your specific concerns were in the area . . . (as specified in the questionnaire)?

B. When did you first realize that you would like assistance? Specify the month.

C. Has this been a recurring concern?

D. Did you seek assistance from anyone? If Yes:

Whom did you consult? Please give their number from this staff list.

Was this assistance satisfactory? Would you say it was very satisfactory, satisfactory, not very satisfactory, or not satisfactory?

If No:

Why did you not seek assistance?

Concerning Conflict Relationships

Would this conflict prevent you seeking consultative assistance from this person?

Would this conflict prevent him seeking consultative assistance from you?

Concerning Socialization Relationships

I notice that you have indicated that you usually share moments of free time with . . . (nominees' names).

1. Why?
2. What do you generally discuss?
3. Do you discuss areas in which you would like consultative assistance with them?
4. You indicated that you associate socially outside school time with . . . (nominees' names). For what kinds of activities do you get together?

Concerning Provision of Consultative Assistance

Have you provided consultative assistance for another member of staff? If Yes:

Please indicate by number from your list, those staff members for whom you have provided consultative assistance.

In what areas have you provided consultative assistance?

How often have you provided consultative assistance? Would you have provided it at least twice a week, at least twice a month, or infrequently?

Are there any questions which you would like to ask me?

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

INTERVIEW ANSWER SHEET

School No. __________

No. __________

PART 1

Task Area No. __________

Actual Concern:

September October November December January February

Recurring

People Consulted Rating

(Repeated for each task area.)

PART 2

Major disagreements?

PART 2

Major disagreements?

Why share moments of free time?

Topics generally discussed?

Do you discuss your consultative concerns with them?

What form of socialization?

PART 3

Provide Consultative Assistance

for: on

2/wk.	2/mth.	Infrequently